THE

CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

APRIL, 1827.

Religious Communications.

LECTURES ON THE SHORTER CATECHISM OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES—ADDRESSED TO YOUTH.

LECTURE XXVII.

The Exaltation of Christ.

We are now to enter on the important subject of Christ's exaltation—It is thus stated in the catechism. "Christ's exaltation consisteth in his rising again from the dead on the third day, in his ascending up into heaven, in sitting at the right hand of God the Father, and in coming to judge the world at the last day."

When we speak of the exaltation of Christ, you are not to understand by it that any new glory was conferred on his divine nature—that was impossible; for as God, his glory was infinite and unchangeable. But this glory, as we have seen, was eclipsed and hidden, while he assumed our nature, and appeared in our world in the form of a servant. His exaltation, therefore, properly and strictly consists in *a manifestation in the human nature*, which for a time had veiled the divine, *of the same glory which he had eternally possessed as the Son of God.* This we are taught in his own intercessory prayer—"And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee, before the world was."

It was with a manifest, and most impressive propriety that this exaltation should succeed immediately to his humiliation. Such is the representation of Scripture. "He humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross; wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Thus it was that the Sun of righteousness, on passing from under the dark cloud of his humiliation and suffering, shone and astonished with the most striking and glorious lustre. The ignominy of the cross was thus wiped away; and God who raised him from the dead and gave him glory, gave to his people also, the evidence, that when their reliance and expectations are placed on him, their faith and hope shall be in God.

Let us now consider the several particulars of our Redeemer's exaltation, as they are stated in the answer before us.

1. He "rose again from the dead on the third day."

We have already had occasion to

observe, that it was a part only of three days, during which our Redeemer lay in the grave. The time of his continuance there indeed, was not equal even to the space of two whole days. Yet as our Lord was in the tomb a part of three days, and it was customary with the Jews and agreeable to the language of Scripture, to represent an event as extending through all the days on which any part of it took place, there was a complete fulfilment, according to the then current use of language, of the declaration, that "the Son of man should be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." Our Redeemer was put to death on the eve of the Jewish Sabbath, Friday afternoon, and rose very early on the morning of the first day of the week, called from this circumstance, *the Lord's day;* and which, from the age of the apostles till the present time, the great mass of Christians have observed as a day of sacred rest, in place of the Jewish Sabbath—The reason and propriety of this will be explained, if we are spared to discuss the fourth commandment.

In the mean time, let us give a few moments of our most engaged attention, to that essential article of a Christian's faith and hope, the resurrection of Christ. That this was an event to take place in the person of the Messiah, was prefigured to Abraham, in his receiving his son Isaac, as it were from the dead. It was foretold to the fathers, as is expressly affirmed by the apostle Paul in his discourse to the Jews at Antioch in Pisidia, who quotes a passage from the second psalm, in proof of the fact. Acts xiii. 33. Our Lord himself, not only alluded to it on several occasions, but told his disciples of it in the most explicit terms. Mark ix. 31.—"He taught his disciples and said unto them—The Son of man is delivered into the hands of men, and they shall kill him, and after that he is killed, he shall rise the third day." Again he said, "*After I am risen,* I will go before you into Galilee." The Jews, therefore, attempted to discredit the resurrection of Christ; and modern infidels still attempt the same thing; knowing that if they succeed in this, they unsettle at once the whole Christian system. On the other hand, the advocates of Christianity defend this point, as the citadel of their faith. Nay, if this one point be maintained, the Christian religion is indisputably established as of divine authority. Sherlock has written an able little work, entitled "The Trial of the Witnesses," in which he has examined the evidence of our Lord's resurrection, on the strict principles and forms of taking testimony in the English courts of law; and has shown, that on those principles, and agreeably to that procedure, an upright judge and jury would be obliged to pronounce that Christ had indubitably risen from the dead. But the ablest piece on this subject, with which I am acquainted, is the production of Gilbert West. It is known to all who read their Bibles carefully, that the accounts given of the resurrection of Christ by the different evangelists, seem, at first view, to be hardly consistent with each other. Now, it is said that West had doubted or disbelieved the truth of revelation, and that he first gave his attention to this subject, with a view to prove that the historians had contradicted each other, and therefore that the fact which they all asserted, was unworthy of credit: that, however, on examining and comparing the evangelists, critically and closely, he found there was no contradiction: that, on the contrary, he perceived there was the most perfect harmony, and that the variety in their accounts was only a palpable proof that they did not write in concert, but, like honest witnesses, each told the facts which he knew, in his own way: in a word, that on a careful comparison

of the facts of the case they all went to establish the same point, by various, but yet concordant and incontestable evidence. In whatever way he was led to it, he has certainly settled this point, beyond reasonable controversy —I advise you all to read the two books I have mentioned—The trial of the Witnesses, and West on the Resurrection.

A summary of the evidence of our Lord's resurrection may be given thus—It rests on testimony; the testimony both of angels and of men. The angels testified to the women who came to the sepulchre, that he was not there, but was risen, as he had told them. The apostles all asserted the truth of his resurrection, and the most of them laid down their lives in attestation of this fact. They unanimously declared that "God raised him up, on the third day, and showed him openly, not to all the people, but to witnesses chosen before of God; even to us, says Peter, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead." This testimony, at the risk of life, was delivered before that very Sanhedrim who had put our Lord to death; and by that very disciple (as the mouth of the rest) who had before denied him.

Our Lord often appeared to his disciples after his resurrection, and gave them such proofs of his identity, as no mortal could rationally disbelieve or doubt. He not only ate and drank with them, showed them the print of the nails in his hands and feet, and of the spear in his side, and made the unbelieving Thomas examine with his hands as well as his eyes, the scars of his wounds; but what was still more unequivocal, if possible, he adverted to what he had told them before his death, and to things which only he and they could possibly know. At one time he showed himself to no less than five hundred brethren.—He remained forty days on earth, that by his appearing frequently, and conversing familiarly and freely with his disciples, they might have the fullest conviction and satisfaction as to his resurrection, and that he might also instruct them in the nature of his kingdom, and in the manner in which it was to be extended, established, and governed.

It was surely one of the most contemptible artifices ever practised—and no doubt it was practised because a better could not be devised—which the chief priests and elders of the Jews employed, when they bribed the Roman soldiers to say, that his disciples came by night, and stole him away while they slept. The soldiers would never have said this, had they not been secured against punishment from the governor, if he should hear it: For in saying it, every one confessed himself guilty of a capital crime; because the Roman discipline made it death, in all cases, for a sentinel to sleep on his post. Beside, the thing, in itself, was both incredible and self contradictory—Incredible, that they should sleep through the great earthquake which accompanied the rolling away of the stone by the angel; and self contradictory, because, if they were asleep, they could not possibly know that his disciples had taken him away. But something must be said: and this was the best that his enemies could find to say.

You will remember, my children, that Christ rose from the dead as *a publick person*, representing all his spiritual seed, and as claiming in their behalf a complete discharge from the penalty of the divine law. Having fully paid the debt for which he was committed to the prison of the tomb, justice required that he, the surety, should be discharged, and that no further demand should be made on those for whom he answered. His resurrection was the declaration of God, that justice was fully satisfied; and it is to be regarded as the divine assurance to every believer, that, for his surety's sake, all his sins shall certainly be remitted.

It is a most delightful theme of meditation, to dwell on the resur-

rection of Christ. It were well to think of it, especially on the morning of every Lord's day—To think of the completion of the work of redemption, when, like a mighty conqueror of sin, death, the grave, and hell, the Redeemer rose triumphant over all; giving to his believing people the most precious pledge of their acquittal from condemnation, of their protection from all those spiritual enemies over which he triumphed, and of their own glorious resurrection in the last day—when their bodies shall be made like unto his own glorious body, and dwell forever in his blissful presence.

(*To be continued.*)

MARTIN LUTHER'S MODEST ACCOUNT OF HIMSELF.

(*Continued from p.* 111.)

The golden rose, already mentioned, was sent to the elector, by MILTITZ, who treated much with me respecting a reconciliation with the pope. He had brought with him seventy handbills,* in order that he might set up one in each town and village on his return to Rome, if the elector should deliver me up to him, as the pope requested. But he let out the secret in conversation with me; for he said, "O Martin, I had supposed that you were an old theologian, who managed these disputations sitting by your fire-side; but I now find that you are strong, and in the vigour of life. If I had twenty-five thousand armed men, I do not believe that I should be able to take you to Rome; for through the whole of my long journey I explored the sentiments of the people, and I found that where there was one in favour of the pope, there were three against him." And what was ridiculous enough, when at the inns, he inquired of the women and maids, what they thought of the *Roman seat.* They knowing nothing of the meaning of the term, and supposing that he was speaking of common domestick seats, answered—what do we know of the kind of seats they have at Rome, whether they are of wood or of stone?

He begged of me that I would study the things which make for peace, and promised that he would use his influence with the pope, that he should do the same. I answered him, that I was most ready to do every thing which I could do with a safe conscience, and without compromitting the truth, to promote peace, of which I was most earnestly desirous: and I assured him that I had not entered voluntarily into these contentions, but had been compelled by necessity to act the part which I had done; and that I did not think that I had exposed myself to any just censure.

Before his departure, he called before him John Tetzel, the first author of this tragedy, and so scourged him with reproofs and threats, that he actually broke the spirit of a man who had before been terrible to every body, and was a declaimer who could not be intimidated; but from this time, he pined away, worn out with grief and dejection. When I knew his situation, I addressed to him a kind letter of consolation, and exhorted him to keep up his spirits, and not suffer himself to be disturbed on account of what had happened to me. He died, however, wounded in conscience, and full of indignation against the pope.

If the archbishop of Mentz had listened to my remonstrance; or if the pope had not so raged against me, and condemned me without a hearing:—If he had adopted the same course which the emperor Charles pursued afterwards, though then too late:—If he had taken effectual measures to repress the audacity of Tetzel, the affair would never have eventuated in such a

* *Brevia Apostolica.* Milner says he brought 70 soldiers.

state of tumult. The original fault was undoubtedly in the Archbishop, who by his wisdom and cunning deceived himself; for his design was to suppress my doctrine, and secure the money gained by the sale of indulgences. But soon all counsels and endeavours were found to be in vain. The LORD watched over these events, and had resolved to judge the people. If they had succeeded in taking my life, it would not have answered their purpose: indeed, I am persuaded that it would have been worse for them than it now is, and some of their most discerning men are convinced of the truth of what I say.

In this same year, (1519) I returned to the interpretation of the Psalms: but thinking that I should become more experienced in this business, if I should first expound the Epistles to the Romans, Galatians, and Hebrews, I undertook in my lectures to go over these books of Scripture. Above all, I was seized with a wonderful ardour to understand Paul's Epistle to the Romans. But before this time, my efforts had been entirely unsuccessful; not owing to the existence of cold blood about the heart, but to one single phrase in the beginning of the epistle, *the righteousness of God is revealed from heaven:* for I hated this word *righteousness;* the only thing I had been taught of the righteousness or justice of God, was, that it was either *formal* or *active;* that is, the attribute by which God is just in himself, or by which he punishes the wicked. But although I had lived an irreprehensible life as a monk, yet my conscience was ill at ease; nor could I place confidence in my own *satisfactions;* therefore, as I said, I did not love, yea I hated God, considered as clothed with vindicatory justice: and if not with secret blasphemy, yet certainly with great murmuring, I opposed myself to God—saying within myself, "as if it was not enough to doom miserable sinners to eternal perdition on account of original and actual sin against the law, does he now add to their misery in the gospel, by there revealing his justice also?" In this manner did I rage, goaded by a guilty conscience. However, I applied myself most earnestly to find out what the apostle meant by these words. And whilst day and night I was occupied in studying this passage, with the context, God had compassion on me; for now I began to perceive, that by the word *righteousness,* in this place, was meant, *that* by which a merciful God by faith justifies the sinner; for it is immediately added, "as it is written, *the just shall live by faith;*" and this is the righteousness which is revealed in the gospel. Upon this, I seemed to myself to have become a new man, and to have entered, with open gates, into paradise itself. Henceforth, the whole scripture appeared to me in a new light. Immediately I ran over the whole Bible, as far as my memory enabled me, collecting all the passages which were analogous to this, or in which there was a similar form of expression; such as *the work of God,* for what he works in us;—*the power of God,* for the strength communicated to us;—*the wisdom of God,* for the wisdom with which we are endued; and so, of *the salvation of God, the glory of God,* &c. Now, by how much I hated the phrase *righteousness of God* before, by so much did I now love and extol it, as the sweetest of all words to me; so that that passage of Paul was to me like the gate of heaven.

Afterwards, I read Augustine's treatise concerning THE LETTER AND SPIRIT, where, beyond my hope, I found that he interpreted *the righteousness of God* in the same way, as being that with which God endues us when he justifies us. And although the view which he takes of the subject is imperfect, and although he does not clearly

explain the subject of imputation, yet I was rejoiced to find him teaching, that *the righteousness of God* was that by which we are justified.

Having now received fresh strength and courage, I betook myself again to expounding the Psalms, and the work would have grown into a large commentary, had I not been interrupted by a summons from the Emperor Charles V. to meet the diet about to convene at Worms, the following year; by which I was compelled to relinquish the work which I had undertaken.

I have given this narrative, good reader, that if you should think of reading these *opuscula* of mine, you may be mindful that I am one of those whose proficiency has arisen from writing and teaching, and not of those who, without effort, suddenly become great: who without labour, without trials, without experience, as it were, with one glance, exhaust the whole meaning of the scriptures.

The controversy concerning indulgences went on through the years 1520 and 1521. Afterwards followed the Sacramentarian and Anabaptist disputes, concerning which I may have occasion to speak in another place.

Reader, farewell in the Lord, pray for the increase of the word, and against Satan, who is malignant and powerful, and now also most furious and cruel, knowing that he has but a short time, and that the kingdom of the pope is in danger. And may God confirm in us that which he hath wrought, and perfect in us the work which he hath begun, to his own glory. Amen.

March 5th, A. D. 1545.

EXTRACTS FROM MASON'S REMAINS.

It signifies nothing to say we will not change our *religion*, if our religion change not *us*.

If a man lives and dies a mere professor, it had been better for him if he had lived and died a mere heathen.

The duty of religion flows from a principle of religion.

It is not talking, but walking with God, that gives a man the denomination of a Christian.

Darkness may as well put on the name of light, as a wicked man the name of a Christian.

It is our main business in this world to secure an interest in the next.

A desire of happiness is natural; a desire of holiness is supernatural.

If God hath done that good *for us* which he hath denied *to the world*, we ought to do that service *for him* which is denied him *by the world*.

If we are willing, God will help us; if sincere, God will accept us.

A serious remembrance of God, is the fountain of obedience to God.

If you forget God when you are young, God may forget you when you are old.

When a Christian considers the goodness of God's ways, he wonders that all the world doth not walk in them. But when he considers the blindness, and depravity, and prejudice of the heart by nature, he wonders that any should enter upon them.

Make your calling sure, and your election is sure.

Uneven walking, with a neglect of watching, makes a disconsolate soul.

Four things a Christian should especially labour after, *viz.* to be *humble* and *thankful, watchful* and *cheerful*.

Miscellaneous.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

Letter IV.

Remedies Proposed.

Dear Sir,—I propose now to examine some of the means employed to lessen, or remove the evils mentioned in my last two letters.

Several expedients have been adopted by the General Assembly to facilitate the despatch of business. I shall not call in question their wisdom. The rules and regulations of the house I approve, but these can never remove, nor correct the evils which I have named. They were not designed for remedies, but to prevent, as long as might be, the necessity of remedial measures.

Lessening the representation from presbyteries, is the only remedy, which has been tried. The history of its trial is this:—In 1819, the Assembly consisted of about one hundred and thirtymembers; when the reports from a majority of presbyteries affirmed the proposed alteration in the ratio of representation, from *six* to *nine*. It was supposed that this measure would reduce the Assembly one-third. This expectation was not realized. The next Assembly consisted of more than one hundred members. Since that time the increase has been constant, and at the close of six years, we find one hundred and seventy-two members. But this remedy is to be still further tried—another alteration has obtained, and *twelve* instead of *nine* is the number for every ministerial delegate. Let us now suppose the effect of this alteration shall be proportionate to that of the former amendment, the next Assembly will then consist of about one hundred and forty members—a larger number than the Assembly of 1818, which proposed the alteration of the ratio from *six* to *nine*. But it is not probable the effect will be proportionate, for two reasons. The number of Presbyteries entitled, according to the last statistical report, to but one minister in the Assembly, was *thirty-one;* whereas in the former case there were only *six*—the difference, in Presbyteries not affected by the change, is as *thirty-one* to *six*. There may be three or four more large presbyteries affected by the present, than by the former change; but this will not counterbalance the other disproportion. In the next place, the number of presbyteries has so multiplied, that one minister and one elder from each would give us a larger Assembly next spring than we had last. It is rational to suppose that, with the increasing facilities of intercourse and travelling, the nearer we approximate to the smallest representation, the less will be the proportionate failure of members to attend.

It is therefore most clear, that the new ratio of representation can be no remedy for the evils. If any one doubts this, let him recollect that, by the last statistical report, *two hundred and sixty* are entitled to seats in the next Assembly. But we know there are already three new Presbyteries, beside large accessions of members to those before existing. On examining the report it will be further seen, that fifteen presbyteries lacked only from one to three members, to entitle each of them to two additional representatives. It is the result of a fair calculation that the whole Presbyterian church will, next spring, be entitled to *two hundred and eighty, or ninety* members, in her highest court.

Suppose the remedy be carried still further, and only one minister and one elder be admitted from each presbytery, it would not remedy the evils. We have already the materials for *one hundred* presbyteries, beside the prospect of rapid increase.

Apply the remedy in its utmost extent, and more than *two hundred* seats may be claimed in that house, before 1830. But this would render the delegation very unequal, and invade a radical principle of our constitution, which gives to large and small presbyteries a proportionate representation. This principle I should very much dislike to lose, and am disposed to resist every encroachment upon its integrity. Why should a remedy be applied which has no efficacy?

A judicial commission, with powers to try all appeals, complaints, and references sent up to the Assembly, has been mentioned. This would be an expedient to relieve the house from a troublesome part of its business—leave the greater number to transact other concerns—and secure, quite as certainly, wisdom and justice in the decision.

On this expedient, it is obvious to remark, that it will either invade the principles of the constitution, or every case must be passed upon by the whole house, after it has been reported by the commission. In the latter form, it would save no time, and ordinarily relieve the house from no perplexity. To answer any of the proposed ends, the expedient must remove the investigation, and of course the decision, from the house; and yet have the confidence of the parties, and of the church.

I think the spirit of prophecy is not needed, to foresee great dissatisfaction with such a course. It is the right of every man who is aggrieved, to submit his case to the highest court. This right ought not to be invaded. But I need not discuss this part of the subject—such an expedient would be unwise and anti-presbyterial.

To terminate all appeals and complaints in the synods, is an expedient proposed by the last Assembly.

To this I have *three objections*. The *first* is, that it invades "*the radical principles*" of Presbyterianism. An organized court of *review* and *control*, before which no *appeal* may be carried, and no *complaint* presented, would be a strange anomaly. The expedient contravenes one of the highest objects of the Assembly, and strikes at the vital principle of its jurisdiction. It is true there will be left the review of synodical records, but this is not a full and efficient control. Documents and parties are forbidden to come before the court—no complaint may be heard unless incorporated with the records. Even in such case, the error cannot be corrected—naked records are always deficient in giving the whole explanation of a case, and never embody arguments from living lips. Beside, the synod becomes a party, and is present while the other is prohibited—this is unjust.

Every court of review and control should have the best means, and all necessary means to ascertain the whole case.—But I need not extend this view of the course—it is not pretended to be introduced on Presbyterial principles—the Assembly considered it an *expedient* to remedy some existing evils. I am no enemy to *expediency*, which submits to *law*, or does not violate the statute principles; but against every expedient to violate wholesome and vital principles, I must protest.

My *second* objection is, *its tendency to weaken the influence* of the Assembly, as *a bond of union and fellowship*.

Prohibit a man, a session, or a presbytery, from seeking redress in the highest judicatory of the church, and you take away one of the strongest reasons of attachment and respect for that body. It seems to me absurd to call upon individuals and courts to cherish, support and obey a judicatory, which they may not approach for the correction of wrongs done them. I may never be injured; but tell me, if I am, that I may not seek redress from the judicatory which I must support and obey, and you lessen my respect for that court.

What is the object of the General

Assembly? is a question will soon be echoed through the land. Is it to make laws for the church? No; its authority is only ministerial. But suppose it were to legislate—Synods, according to the proposed measure, can make laws as well as assemblies, if they can judge and execute better. Every argument in favour of the expedient is as good for the entire abolition of the Assembly, as for the proposed measure. Is the object to supervise the proceedings of Synods? Synods are as capable of terminating all other supervision, as that of appeals and complaints. Consequently you do not bind me to respect the Assembly in consideration of any ability, or necessity implied in this.

Is it to give the whole church knowledge of her religious state? Each synod is certainly competent to publish its own report, and send it to all the other synods.

Is it to superintend theological seminaries? May not this be done by synods quite as well as by the Assembly; since a theological professor, who may be unjustly censured by a presbytery, or synod, cannot appeal to the Assembly? No, my dear sir, I have not more confidence in a synod than I have in the General Assembly; therefore I would not terminate the most important business of a church court in a synod.

Is the object to preserve *purity* of doctrine, and the *peace* of the whole church? Why prohibit an appeal for those very objects? Why prevent the influence and authority of the whole church from bearing upon these vital interests? *Expediency* is the reason given. But we ought to look well, before we sacrifice principle to an expedient. Will the church be satisfied, I think not. Nothing should ever be done to weaken the attachment of the church to her Assembly—nothing to promote sectional feelings and interests.

My *third* objection is, that its *object cannot be attained*—and the expedient will only serve to *perplex* the Assembly, and increase dissatisfaction in the church.

Every case, in which a synod is not perfectly unanimous, will come up by protest. If every document in the case, both of testimony and records, from all the courts below, be not spread on the minutes, it must be ordered up, which will occasion one year's delay. If the whole volumes of documents are registered in the synod book, they must be read, the whole case investigated, opposed by the minority protesting, and defended by the majority. Such course will inevitably occasion more loss of time, and more perplexity, than appeals and complaints regularly brought up—and it is no difficult problem to solve, whether the parties, or the church, will be better satisfied.

To make the measure effective, you must shut out the possibility of getting the case before the Assembly. Cast as many difficulties in the way as you will, the litigious appellant and the aggrieved judicatory are not prevented the approach. You cannot make the way so difficult that they will not occupy it, to your greater annoyance. Possibility of access is enough to set aside the contemplated effect of the expedient.

But suppose it should stop the cases from coming before the Assembly, it would not remedy the evils which I have named. Those evils do not arise out of appeals and complaints—of course stopping them will neither remove, nor essentially diminish, the difficulties. All that the measure can promise, is to lessen the time of the Assembly's sessions—and even that I do not believe it can accomplish. Yours, truly, &c.

Feb. 22. 1827.

TRAVELS IN EUROPE FOR HEALTH IN 1820. BY AN AMERICAN CLERGYMAN OF THE SYNOD OF PHILADELPHIA.

(*Continued from p.* 69.)

London, Aug. 29th, 1820.

My Dear Friend,—It was not my

intention to say a word to you concerning the noted objects of curiosity which London offers to the attention of strangers—as the Tower, the Monument, St. Paul's, &c. &c., which have been so abundantly described by others, whose leisure for observation, and powers of description, so far surpass what has fallen to my lot. But I cannot resist the impulse I feel, to tell you something of that consecrated place, Westminster Abbey; a place consecrated to the ashes and memorials of the "mighty dead;" surpassing in interest every other place of the kind which is, or perhaps has been, on the face of our globe. The building itself—once a Roman Catholick church, before the Reformation—without reference to its contents, is a great curiosity. It would be esteemed an immense edifice, did not the vastness and magnificence of St. Paul's Cathedral cast it so far into the back ground. Its exterior indicates great age, and so much has it suffered by the dilapidations of time, that a renovation has become absolutely necessary.—And it is at this time undergoing repair that will, when executed, make it appear quite new. As far as this repair has progressed, an exact copy of its ancient figure and ornament is preserved. On entering, one cannot help a feeling of awe, as if approaching the presence of those, whom learning, nobility, or great achievements, had elevated to a kind of semi-deity. A guide, for the compensation of an English shilling, takes you from object to object, and hurries over a brief explanation of all he shows you. But his hurrying from object to object, impatient to get through his task, soon made me impatient of his haste; so that I often chose to forego his explanation, and linger behind the group that followed him, that I might view particular objects with more leisure. It is indeed a place to moralize on faded greatness. Here you see wax figures, bearing, it is said, a correct likeness of many of the ancient kings and queens of England, and dressed in the identical clothes they wore, before the grave had devoured them. And to be sure, the grotesque fashion of dress, and cumber of ornament, leaves no ground to regret that fashion, in its fickleness, has deviated far from what it was in the days of Elizabeth. With no small excitement I gazed on the figure of this princess; a little old woman, whose withered countenance and weasoned arms and hands, form an astonishing contrast to the ideas of masculine greatness I had been accustomed to form of her, from reading her history. A figure of Lord Nelson, dressed also in the clothes he wore, attracted my attention, still more than that of any of the crowned heads of ancient times. Very few monarchs in British history will continue to receive from Englishmen, half the devotion that will be offered to the memory of this naval hero. While looking upon his figure, decorated with the insignia of those honours which his grateful country has bestowed upon him, I could not help thinking—what has become of his immortal soul! What has been its reception, passing from the triumph of victory, to the tribunal of judgment, where the highest grade of military merit makes no compensation for a destitution of faith, and the absence of the love of God from the heart! If biography speak truth in his case, how hopeless, on Christian principle, must be the fate of his lordship. Who would not enter the eternal world in the capacity of the least of the regenerated ones, rather than in that of the hero of Trafalgar? "Let me die the death of the righteous;" and let me keep constantly in view, as an effectual damper to the ambition which sacrifices the hopes of the Christian to worldly grandeur, that tremendous day, "when many that are last shall be first, and the first last."

My curiosity in viewing the contents of this wonderful church, dedicated much less to the worship of Deity than to the homage of the great and noble of past ages, has

been robbed of more than half its gratification, by the preparations for the coronation of his present majesty, which fill the greater part of it. You have no doubt been informed, that this ceremony was to have taken place some time ago. It has been postponed until after the trial of the queen, which is just now taking place. The object of the old monarch (old in years, but especially in constitution, though a young king) is, to obtain a divorce; and thus escape the sad mortification of having his hated wife crowned along with him. In the middle of the church a long platform is erected, of rough boards, and at each side, seats of the same, rise one behind another, like a gallery, to the sides of the house. Thus the spectators, whose privilege it will be, on this august occasion, to occupy them—covered as they will then be with the finest carpeting—will have full opportunity to see the whole spectacle. The coronation chairs are really a curiosity. They are simple rush-bottomed arm chairs, of the very rudest construction, without polish, stained a red colour with some kind of paint. They must have been formed at the time when arm-chairs were first getting into use among kings, and when plebeians had only three-legged stools. As relicks of antiquity, which indicate the progress of the arts, they are very precious articles. I have had the honour of sitting in one of them, and presume the advantages I have derived therefrom, may equal what most of my predecessors have enjoyed, when their accounts of gain and loss have been fairly balanced.

The trial of Queen Charlotte is the one object which at this moment seems to engross all London, and I suppose I may say all England; and that to a degree entirely beyond what I would have supposed any thing of the kind could have effected. It fills every newspaper I see, and is the leading topick of conversation in every company. It has raised such a ferment in the minds of the populace, as requires the strong arm of military force to restrain from breaking out into violent outrage. It is indeed a bitter sarcasm on monarchical government, and a stigma on the good sense of the nation, that a whole people should be thrown into such a ferment, by the disgraceful squabbles of one man with his wife; both of whom, it is acknowledged on all hands, rank with the very lowest in the community, in point of moral respectability. It is enough to make every American hug his republicanism, and rejoice for his country; where I fondly hope the monarchy of publick opinion would, before long, compel such august personages as have created this disturbance, to find their level, very far below the high stations they occupy here.

The trial had been suspended for a while, until a fresh cargo of witnesses should be imported from Italy; and these having arrived, it has been again resumed, with increased interest. The apartment where the House of Lords meet, before whom the trial is pending, is small, and the regulation is, that every peer has the privilege of introducing two friends, and no more. Of course, as there are so many whose claims take precedence of mine, with this honourable body, I have had no admittance. Indeed it has been with some effort I obtained a stand within sufficient distance to see the house, at the time of adjournment, and to witness the occurrences of that occasion. To keep off the crowd, double rows of post and rail fence are run quite across the street, both above and below Parliament house, so as to enclose a large vacant space in front. Between the ranges of this fence, on both sides, a file of infantry with fixed bayonets are stationed. And within the enclosed portion of street, in front of the house, a strong corps of reserve are posted. Accompanied by a mercantile friend, I repaired to the place nearly an hour before 4 P. M., which we were told was the usual hour of adjournment. But

such was the gorge of human beings in the street, for a great distance, that we did not think it safe to venture among them, farther than to be just in sight of the house. Here we found an opportunity of stationing ourselves on an elevated step, with our backs to the wall, which enabled us to see over the heads of the crowd. It was not long until the whole street above us, became equally crowded with the distance intervening between us and the Parliament house. Such an immense mass of human beings collected into one place, I never saw before. It served to give a person an idea of the vast population of London; but surely it is little credit to their good sense and sober habits, that an occasion so trivial, should call them together in such quantity. The sole object was to see the queen, and do homage to her as she passed. We had waited nearly three hours, until my patience was completely exhausted, when the huzzaing and hubbub near the house, gave notice that her majesty had made her appearance. With no small effort, the military, with the point of the bayonet, cleared a passage for her up the street, past where we stood. Her carriage showed great splendour. It was drawn by six horses, which with the postillions, three in number, glittered in gold lace. The falling top was down, so as to allow the gazing multitude a full view of her person. She sat alone, on the hind seat, while a maid of honour sat facing her on the seat before. She was dressed in plain mourning, as the whole nation is, for old George the Third. Her appearance was that of a rather lusty, good looking woman, verging towards fifty, without any thing remarkable about her. Loud, repeated "huzzas for the queen," thundered along the street as she passed up, while white handkerchiefs and flags waved from the crowded windows and balconies, on each side. Her countenance expressed complacent smiles; but surely her heart must have been wrung with inward bitterness.

Shortly after the queen, the lords followed, some in carriages, and some on horseback, making their way through the crowd at a very slow gait. The friends of her majesty were greeted with loud cheers; while groans, hisses, and insulting grimace, were plentifully bestowed upon her enemies. I was not a little amused, to observe the perfect sang froid with which it was all received on the part of their lordships. They moved along, without indicating by any change of feature, that they so much as noticed what was taking place around them. The king, since the commencement of the trial, has kept close at his palace at Windsor, about twenty miles distant from London. It is generally believed he would not be safe from insult, and perhaps something worse, from the enraged mob, should he make his appearance in the city. Such is the interest taken in this trial, and such the avidity of the publick mind to know its progress, that to gratify it, the printers, by an astonishing effort, have the testimony of every day published in the evening papers of the same. The mass of testimony already taken, filed as I have seen it in some of the papers, is sufficient to make a large octavo volume. It is an amount of brothel abomination, utterly surpassing any thing I have ever seen in print. The sober part of the community lament exceedingly, as well they may, its exposure to the publick eye, on account of the corrupting effect it is calculated to have. If only a moiety of it is true, her majesty must be a character of uncommon baseness. Yet it appears as if the popular favour towards her rose, in proportion as the testimony against her increased, both in quantity and malignity. The populace regard her as a persecuted woman. The whole testimony against her being that of foreigners, is considered a mass of hired perjury; of course its abun-

dance and blackness is proof, in their estimation, not of her guilt, but of the malignity of her persecutors. Besides, it is alleged with acknowledged truth, that she cannot be worse, in the particular criminality with which she is charged, than her royal consort. And the publick mind revolts at the depravity and cruelty on his part, in pursuing her for crimes not worse than his own, and crimes into the strong temptation to which he compelled her, by casting her off, so soon after having married her. The uniform favour, too, extended to her, to the very time of his derangement, on the part of the old king, is a powerful support to her cause. The very high estimation in which the memory of old George the Third is held among all classes, altogether surprises me. From no quarter have I heard any thing but the voice of eulogy. Among the religious community, it appears to be a unanimous sentiment, that he is a saint in heaven. The *good old king* is his usual appellation.

The publick mind is at this time in a violent ferment. Political parties run very high; and the licentiousness of the press quite surprises me. It appears to equal any thing that ever existed on our side of the Atlantick. I have seen a pamphlet publication, entitled "A Peep at the Peers," in which the high titles, hereditary distinctions, and large salaries from government of many in the House of Lords, are handled with all the roughness of which democracy is capable. Did I not know the rude shocks which the British government has resisted, I should be ready to apprehend things here to be fast verging to a crisis, that might result in revolution. The discontent in the publick mind is certainly very great. But the most discouraging item in the whole aspect of affairs is, the hold which infidelity has on the community—very far, I think, beyond what exists in the United States. I have observed, inscribed in large letters, over the door of a printing office, in a publick street, "*The Office of the Republican and Deist.*" The conspirators lately executed for an attempt to massacre the ministers, were notoriously of this description. After their condemnation, some of them expressed great contrition, and gladly received the visits of such clergy as called on them. Thesselwood, their chief, remained obdurate to the last. On the scaffold, it is said, he remarked to one of his associates, "we shall soon know the grand secret;" alluding either to the being of a God or the truth of revelation.

To-morrow I expect to bid adieu to London,—certainly with some regret, to leave so soon a place where there is so much to be seen and heard. But I suppose it would be still more so, after a month's sojourn. I have been informed that the medicinal waters of Cheltenham are very much of the same kind with those of Bagnieres, from which I derived so much benefit, and that the place itself is very inviting; and health being my paramount object, I have concluded to spend some time there on my way to Liverpool, from which I count upon sailing by the beginning of October.

Sincerely, yours, &c.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

TRANSATLANTICK RECOLLECTIONS.

*No. IX.**

"Forsan et hæc olim meminisse juvabit."

It is well known that the Province of Ulster is the strong hold of Presbyterianism in Ireland. This is easily accounted for, from the fact of its propinquity to the coast of Scotland, from which country the forefathers of the present race emigrated. Belfast, the capital of this province, a place of some notoriety, is beautifully situated on Carrickfergus Bay.

* This number ought to have been published before the last—an accident prevented it. We therefore still affix to it No. IX.—EDIT.

This town has rendered itself prominent in the days that are gone, for its active resistance of arbitrary power; and it still retains its character for a devotedness to freedom. No part of Ireland stands higher in the rank of literary eminence, or has done more for the civil and literary illumination of the country, than this northern metropolis. Its merchants are, generally speaking, men of literary acquirements, and consequently patrons of the arts and sciences. In fact, so devotedly are they attached to mental improvement, and so liberal and princely are they in its encouragement, that this place has been not unjustly designated as the Athens of the island. But notwithstanding this, such is the liberality of their politics, and their independence of character, that they are constantly under the suspicion of the administration. As illustrative of this, I will give you a short history of the *Belfast Academical Institution*—for they have never been able to procure for it the appellation of a *college*.

It is matter of history, that both English and Papal episcopacy have long had collegiate institutions in Ireland, liberally, if not lavishly endowed—while Presbyterians had to repair to another kingdom, to seek an education which could not be afforded them in their own. The inhabitants of Belfast, ever alive to the literary wants of their country, had long thought of the necessity of supplying this great want; and in fact, the sentiment which prevailed throughout the whole province of Ulster, seconded and stimulated their feelings. It was supposed by many, and hoped by all, that the English government, which had been liberal even to prodigality, upon the same subject to its own church, and which extended this liberality to a sect which it denominates "the whore of Babylon," and for the downfall of which it prays—would foster an institution for the Presbyterians also. This supposition was strengthened by the fact, that an Irishman, and the son of a Presbyterian elder, was at that time, prime minister of state, and prime confidant of royalty. Under these auspices, and with this expectation, the inhabitants of Belfast, with a liberality of pocket only commensurate with the liberality of their political sentiments, erected a magnificent brick building, as part of a large and extended plan, for the purposes of a collegiate establishment.

After they had thus erected a building, and in part made provision for professors, they modestly asked the assistance of the government, in a work which they found too great for their own strength. On this application, the administration, with reluctance granted them the paltry pittance of £1500 annually. But as if they repented doing at all what they did with reluctance, they soon found an excuse to recal it; and this excuse was a *toast*, complimentary to the United States of America; which was given by one of the under teachers of the institution, at a dinner, on St. Patrick's day. This *rebellious toast* soon found its way to the cabinet of the prime minister; and immediately the board of managers of the Belfast Academical Institution, were officially informed, that his majesty's government could not countenance, much less support, such a nursery of republicanism and rebellion, and that it must recal the grant unless—unless what? Why, unless they would resign into their hands the direction of it!—That is, that the Presbyterians, after erecting splendid buildings, and partly endowing them, should give them into the hands of Episcopalians. This they rejected with contempt, and the annuity was withdrawn. But this was not all. Lord Castlereagh, in his anxiety to crush the institution, endeavoured to prevent the Presbyterian Synod of Ulster giving it their patronage; and to accomplish this nefarious design, engaged as a tool and coadjutor, his old political friend, the Rev. Dr. Black, of the city of Londonderry—a man of gigantic powers of mind, and who had long been

a leader among his brethren. Their first efforts were to be directed, at the first meeting of Synod, against the propriety of choosing a professor of theology for the institution. The period soon arrived when the Synod was to meet, and the great question was brought forward; when the Head of the church raised up another David, who not only succeeded in triumphantly carrying the point at issue, but in fact, dethroned Dr. Black, and took possession of his place and influence. So decided and unanimous was the Synod in this affair, that but a single individual voted with the Doctor and the prime minister; and he was one of those lesser lights that are contented to be satellites to bodies of greater magnitude. From this time Dr. Black was supposed to labour under a privation of intellect, until he put an end to his mortal existence, by throwing himself over the Derry bridge into Lough Foyle. Poor man, he was frequently, before this sad catastrophe, heard saying to himself, as he walked his room—"Dr. Black must be wrong. Had the *whole* Synod voted against him, I should have thought him right, and the Synod wrong; but when the only fool in the whole body saw as he saw, and voted as he voted, he must be wrong." It was but a short time after this, when walking, as if in meditation, along the noble and picturesque bridge which crosses the Foyle, at Derry, the Doctor suddenly stopt, pulled off his surtout coat, handed it to a boy who at that moment was passing, and plunged into the swelling flood. The affrighted boy ran to the brink, and beheld the body rise—and sink, to rise no more.

Dr. Black and Lord Castlereagh were old and intimate friends, and in the opinion of many, were coadjutors in degrading poor Ireland. They both commenced their political career on the side of liberty, went over together to the side of tyranny, lived together on terms of great intimacy, and worse than all, in death were not separated; for it is a singular and a melancholy coincidence, that they both died deranged, and by their own hands.

Poor Ireland, what a splendid misery she is destined to bear! At the time when the whole Presbyterian population of Ireland asked the English government to assist them in endowing a literary institution, they had every thing apparently in their favour. An Irishman was prime minister.—An Irishman was generalissimo of her armies, reaping laurels enough to have covered the nakedness of his beggared birth-place.—An Irishman was viceroy of India, reigning with a splendour which nothing but distance prevented from eclipsing the brilliancy even of his Britannick Majesty; and to complete this Irish galaxy, the House of Commons, without contest or dispute, bestowed the palm of eloquence upon an Irish orator; and yet Ireland could not keep this little pittance—So true it is, that a "house divided against itself cannot stand."

Notwithstanding, however, all this opposition, Belfast has supported its institution to this day; and, in point of literary standing, it is second to none of its age and experience. Its plan is unique and comprehensive, including within it a common school, a high school, and university; yet so incorporated together, that they are inseparable parts of a whole. A boy may go in there, hardly able to read, and come out a linguist, or a naturalist, or a chymist, or a mathematician, or a logician, or a moralist. At the date of these recollections, its faculty numbered eight professors, independently of head masters and tutors, and some of these men of eminent and profound talents. Its chemical and natural philosophy chair, was filled by Dr. Knight; and the elegant and accomplished Dr. John Young, presided with honour to himself, and to the institution, in the department of Ethics. The well-known and profound philologist, Nelson, was professor of Greek and Hebrew; while Mr. Thompson, destined, if his health and life are pre-

served, to become one of the first mathematicians of the age, presided in the department of mathematics, and its kindred sciences. Since the period referred to, this Institution has suffered the inestimable loss of the great philologist, Dr. Nelson, a man who bade fair to give his country a splendid name, in that walk of science. While paying this little tribute to the memory of a great scholar, my mind turns almost instinctively to his name-sake and countryman, the present professor of languages in Rutgers College, New Brunswick—a man, cast in a similar mould, pursuing the same path, and travelling it too, with the same gigantick strides. In fact, when I first looked upon Dr. Nelson, of Brunswick, I soon found, by his mental vigour and acumen, that he was a representative, not only in name, and country, and pursuits, but in talents and erudition also, to the lamented professor of languages in the Belfast Academical Institution.—I trust that no sinister motive may be attributed to an obscure and anonymous Remembrancer, for noticing, with so much freedom, a living character, belonging to a neighbouring and flourishing college. It has been prompted solely by the singular coincidence of name, and country, and pursuits, and talents, with a great man, whose laurels are now waving over his cold grave: together with the warm and unfeigned pleasure which I have, to know that *such* a representative of *such* a man, is now labouring for the character of American literature, and the prosperity and honour of the American church.

A HINT TO LAY-CORRESPONDENTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

Sir—Through a former number of your Miscellany was addressed "a Hint to *Booksellers*." Of the writer of that article I know nothing; but the hint he gives needs not the sanction of a name, or of a title, and in further elucidation of the principles it contains, I design to give "a Hint to *Lay-correspondents*."

Perhaps I cannot put over my remarks the superscription "disinterested;" yet I believe I am not in a mood to complain, or to stir up improper feelings in others; and if the evil I wish removed be of no great magnitude, it admits of easy remedy.

As, in all cases, every man is obligated to do the greatest amount of good possible in his circumstances and with his talents, so is he specially bound to improve his *professional* opportunities of usefulness; and every thing is to be regretted which tends to limit his influence in this respect. I need not argue with my reader on the advantages of epistolary correspondence, when properly conducted. Those especially, who are in a peculiar state of mind, may be not a little benefited by the well-timed remarks of an absent ministerial acquaintance. In this way, a minister may "be instant out of season," and that minister is hardly heedful of the apostolick injunction, who is not desirous to improve, to the spiritual benefit of his friends, any special dispensations of Providence or of grace, that may be allotted to them. Others, it is true, may be equally useful in this way; but I choose to confine my remarks to ministers, for a reason assigned in 1 Pet. v. 1, as also because, for the most part, they are better qualified for this duty, and are likely to be more successful, in a matter apparently growing out of their professional character. Let the reader distinctly understand that we claim no compensation for these collateral services: nay, we account the man unfit for the sacred office, who is unwilling to bestir himself in duty, except in view of some earthly remuneration. A man, called of God to this office, will prefer it, in the most impoverishing circumstances, to any other post, however lucrative. He yields him-

self a living sacrifice to God, and is willing to encounter any difficulty and expense in his master's service. But those sacrifices which he ought to be willing to make, others ought not to be willing, and have no right, to exact. If a minister write frequently in such cases, he must subject himself to no inconsiderable expense, unless the answers to his communications be post-paid. The hint is now forthcoming—"Let Lay-correspondents, in these circumstances, bear the *entire* expense."

As a confirmation of the foregoing reasoning, we observe—

1. It is an axiom in morals, that the party benefited ought to bear the burden. Every man is doubtless a gainer by the discharge of duty. It is a privilege, as well as a duty, to do good to all men as we have opportunity. Those who water others shall be watered in return: and that minister is not likely to be a serviceable correspondent to others, who is not richly repaid in his own bosom. But as the good of others is here the primary object, they certainly ought to bear the expense.

2. We are led to the same conclusion by analogy.

Those indeed are to be pitied, who regard the ministerial office as a mere profession, and whose prompting principle to the discharge of its duties is not the love of Christ. They may preach Christ to others, but themselves, if not renewed, will at last be castaways. Yet a minister of the gospel is a professional character, and entitled to the same professional immunities as others. *His* professional employment so coalesces with the ordinary duties and kindnesses of life, that we lose sight of him as a professional man. So far, this is quite to our mind, and promotive, we think, of his usefulness: but at the same time, we would not have you ignorant, brethren, that in other professions, gratuitous counsel is the *utmost* ever looked for.

Finally. Do you not desire an *increase* of ministerial usefulness?

You will not deny that many have been useful by correspondence, nor that many besides might be useful in the same way. Do you blame ministers for negligence in this particular? Look at Rom. 2d chap. 1st verse, and 2d clause. The revenues of the clergy, for the most part, in this country, are very limited: and, even aside from the manifest injustice of being subject to an additional expense for every additional duty, most of the ministers of the gospel dare not engage in extensive correspondence. How easily might this hindrance be removed, and the field of ministerial usefulness be enlarged! The expense, though considerable when convergent on him, would not be felt if distributed among his correspondents, agreeably to the hint already given. The indirect efforts of a minister might then spread over as wide a surface, and be productive of as healthful an influence, as his direct annunciations of gospel truth.

The delinquency alluded to, is owing, I believe, in a great measure, to inadvertence. The minds of our Lay-brethren merely need to be stirred up, by way of *remembrance*, on this particular: and should the hint now given, remove to any extent the barrier, and rouse useful epistolary talent out of its present *forced* dormancy, the writer of this article will have the requital he mainly seeks.

May ministers every where, and their people, be each others living and approving epistle, in the day when the secrets of all hearts shall be manifested by Jesus Christ.

The foregoing remarks, in a great measure, preclude the necessity of subscribing myself

A Clergyman.

Reviews.

FITCH'S DISCOURSES ON THE NATURE OF SIN.

(*Concluded from p.* 136.)

But we come to the third argument, which in all reason ought to have been the first; and which, if substantiated, was the only one that was necessary.

"I appeal again," says the writer, (p. 8th) "to *the views of God*, as expressed in his *law*, his *judgment*, and his direct *testimony*."

As this is the kind of evidence to which we feel disposed implicitly to submit, we have, with some solicitude, examined what Professor Fitch has written, to see whether the scriptures do indeed pronounce a decisive sentence in his favour. But we can truly say we have found nothing of that import. The Professor may be said to have run away with the argument, rather than to have set it before our eyes in a clear light. Let it be distinctly kept in view, that there is no question whether *actual* sin consists essentially in wrong exercise of mind; in this all are agreed. Therefore, if ever so many texts are adduced, in which such exercises are required, or in which contrary exercises are denounced as sinful, nothing is proved which any one is disposed to deny. The single point in debate is, whether that *nature of the soul* from which a continual succession of evil thoughts proceeds, is sinful? Here, he denies, and we affirm. Now, the sum and substance of what he produces in proof from scripture, is, that the law of God commands nothing else but voluntary actions, and forbids nothing else, therefore sin consists in nothing else. "*Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself.*"

In answer, we observe, that the law of God in requiring our love, does virtually require that state, or temper, or disposition of the soul, from which love proceeds, as a stream from its fountain—Where there is a uniform failure of those exercises of love which the law requires, not only is there a fault in the deficiency of holy acts, but in that state, or nature of the soul, which is the cause of this defect. And as we understand the scriptures, this corruption of heart, which is antecedent to its acts, and is the source of their evil, is often spoken of in the word of God. The professor does, indeed, insist, that when the scriptures speak of an *evil heart*, they mean nothing more than the sinful volitions of the heart, independently of their cause. But we have nothing for this interpretation of such expressions, but his own assertion. We think otherwise; and will endeavour to prove, that there are texts of scripture which do not admit of this interpretation. It is somewhat remarkable, that in neither of these discourses, is there any mention of those passages of scripture, which have commonly been adduced to prove the doctrine of inherent depravity. That remarkable passage in the 51st Psalm, is one to which we refer: *Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.* Now, unless in the first moment of existence when conceived in the womb, there be an exercise of volition, in which the embryo, as a moral agent, violates a known rule of duty, these words can never be reconciled with Professor F.'s theory—He will be under the necessity of resorting to the old, forced construction of the Pelagians.

Again, in Job, it is said, *Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one.* And Ephes. xi. 3. *And were* BY NATURE *the children of wrath even as others.* What the author has learnedly written, in one of his notes, in explanation of the

word καρδια, does by no means satisfy us, that the common understanding of that word, according to which it signifies the seat of the affections, is not the true one. It is so generally admitted, that a succession of thoughts or volitions, good or evil, must have a principle, or source from which they originate, that it is commonly assumed as a self-evident truth: And we do not perceive, that the author of these discourses denies this principle. He is not one of those who think that our thoughts have no cause of their existence in the soul itself. This he admits; but denies that there is any moral evil in this cause, however sinful its effects may be. We shall have occasion again to return to this point. On the present argument we would only observe further, that what has already been mentioned, respecting sins of omission, is itself a sufficient answer to all that is said on this part of the subject, and proves conclusively that all sin does not consist in *acts*, for the root of all sin is the *omission* of loving God.

The fourth and last argument of the preacher is, "An appeal (p. 12) to the *absurdity* of supposing that any thing else should constitute a ground of blame, in the subjects of moral government; and the *reasonableness* of taking this view."

"For," says he, "what other view can we take that leads not to *absurdity?* For, sin *must* lie, either in the *consequences* of wrong choices of the agent, or in the *causes* of them, or else in the *wrong choices themselves.* But sin cannot lie simply in the *consequences* of wrong choices, that they occasion evil to others. For although it may be true that sin does in most cases occasion evil to others, yet the sin itself is distinct from the evil flowing from it, nor does it essentially consist in its actually occasioning evil to others. For, ravenous beasts may occasion evil to others by their conduct, as well as men; and among men, it may be that, the worst sins in them may be prevented from actually bringing evil on others, and their best conduct, on the other hand, (as in the administration of salutary correction,) may occasion it in a high degree.

"Nor can it lie in the *causes* that influence an agent to sinful choices. I mean any cause which precedes in the order of nature, and renders certain the sinful determinations and choices of the agent. For although a previous choice, which was wrong, may influence an agent in making a present wrong choice, yet to make a present sin consist in its being occasioned by a previous choice which was wrong, would equally require us to make the sin of that previous choice itself, to lie, not in itself, but in some previous sinful choice of the agent which influenced him to it; and so on, till we come to the first choice or act of will in the series, which could have no act of will preceding it to constitute it sin,—so that on this position there could be no such thing as sin, in the whole series of acts from first to last. Besides, many things influence an agent to a present determination of evil, aside from previous determinations: things which are wholly out of his own being, and pertain wholly to the agency of others: and to make his sin lie in such a cause of his determinations, and not in his determinations themselves, would be to make that pertain to his being which did not pertain to his being."

As to the consequences of *wrong choices*, we have nothing to do with them now. What we assert and what Professor F. denies, is, that the causes of sinful choices, which exist in the disposition, or temper of the soul itself, are sinful. We have not been able to see that he has made it appear, that any absurdity is consequent on this opinion. What is said about one choice being influenced by a previous one, is nothing to the purpose. The common belief of men is, that the cause of evil choices is a moral corruption existing in the soul; and we do not see a single word in the amplification of this argument, which goes to show that there is any absurdity in such a supposition. Indeed, to our apprehension, the absurdity lies all on the other side. To maintain, that there is a cause existing in the soul from which all sinful volitions proceed, and yet, that this principle has no moral evil in it, bears very much the appearance of a palpable absurdity. It seems to us like saying, that there is something, or rather every thing, in an effect, which was not in its cause; which is the same as to say that

there is an effect without a cause. Or it is like the assertion that if a vessel contain poison, yet there is nothing evil in it, unless the contents be put in motion.

The point of difference between Professor F. and us, is not, whether the posterity of Adam have undergone a change in consequence of his fall. This, indeed, he seems reluctant to grant in the body of his discourses, but in the notes appended, he plainly recognises the fact, that there is an "effect on their constitution, which renders their sinning certain." There is then a corruption of the constitution of man. Somehow or other, his soul has suffered injury. This is admitted. The soul is so injured that the sinning of every man who comes into the world is certain; and it is also certain, that left to himself, he will do nothing else but sin. This depravity, Professor F. and those who agree with him, assert, is not of a moral nature—is not sinful. If it be not moral, then, to use the language of this school, it is *physical*. The true state of man by nature, therefore, according to this theory, is, that he inherits from Adam, a *physical defect*, which is the certain cause of his sinning, but which has in itself nothing of the nature of sin. The heart is diseased, but there is no evil in the disease, until it puts forth acts; and although the disease of the heart is the sole cause of the evil of the actions, yet the heart which produces these streams of moral evil, partakes not at all of that malignity which it communicates. While the thoughts and volitions which it sends forth are abominable and deserving of eternal death, the source itself is pure, and entirely free from fault. If men can please themselves with such philosophy and theology as this, they are welcome to all the honour and gratification which their peculiar notions may obtain for them. But what is not a little surprising, they establish that very *physical depravity* of which they are so much afraid. Adam has "entailed upon his posterity *the causes* of sin, mortality, and condemnation."—(p. 43.)

But after all, this is the labouring point in the new system; and the Professor seems exceedingly unwilling to come to an explanation of what constitutes this necessity of sinning, in all Adam's posterity: and upon a second reading of what he says, we are doubtful whether or not he makes this inherited cause of sinning, to be internal or external. "Do you ask," says he, "how Adam could occasion a moral certainty, applying to every instance of his posterity? I may reply, that if I cannot tell how, it may yet be true; for there are many instances of moral certainty which I know to be in fact founded on their proper causes, but cannot exactly state how they are." We are the more disposed to doubt, whether we have understood the writer correctly on this point, because in a pamphlet, on human depravity, published in the city of New York, and believed to be from the same school, the writer explicitly denies that the soul of man has suffered any injury by the fall; and asserts that the certainty of sinning (which he also admits) is owing entirely to the state of temptation to which man is exposed. Now, this is honestly speaking out. When a man avows such opinions as these, we know where to place him. He may still profess to be orthodox, and may associate with the orthodox; but if this is not barefaced Pelagianism, then Pelagius was no Pelagian. But Professor F. is extremely cautious here. He endeavours to keep this point out of view, by raising a mist about it. He asks a question, and then flies off with a vague, unsatisfactory reply. Now to us it seems to be a cardinal point, to know where this cause lies. If it be internal, then an internal remedy is needed; if it exist in outward circumstances, then it will be sufficient to seek to have these changed. This is certainly a point which ought not to be left in the dark. Men, it seems, are under a moral certainty

of sinning, and doing nothing else but sin, as long as they are left to themselves; but why so? Where is the cause? Is there any defect in our nature, which lays us under this sad necessity? We really need information here. But the Professor will give us no satisfaction. He says, "there are many instances of moral certainty which I know to be in fact founded on their proper causes, but cannot exactly state what they are."

If ingenious men did not involve themselves in a mist of metaphysics, they never could persuade themselves, that such a theory as we are now considering, would have any tendency to remove the objections which are made to the scriptural doctrine of original sin. The doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin is first rejected as unreasonable and unrighteous—And what then? Why men, in consequence of being the children of Adam, are born in a state of inherent depravity; and for this depravity, which is visited on them for no other reason but because their first father was depraved, they are doomed to everlasting misery. It requires little discernment to see that this scheme removes no difficulty; or if it seem to remove one, it substitutes another far more formidable. Hence this scheme of inherent depravity is rejected by some, and a new theory is invented. Men, it is said, do not inherit from Adam sin of any kind, either imputed or inherent: but only "*the causes*" of sin, mortality, and condemnation. Thus all the difficulties about original sin, it is supposed, are removed at once—There is in fact no such thing. Very good: but how is it then, that all men sin as soon as they are capable of moral action? The explanation is, that they have entailed on them from Adam, "*the causes* of sin, mortality, and condemnation." And will the cavilling rationalist be satisfied with this? No; he will say immediately—"It is a pitiful evasion. You tell me I am not a sinner by inheritance from Adam, but assure me that the *causes* of sin are entailed upon me—causes, so certain in their operation, that not one of all the millions of Adam's race ever escaped the pollution." And truly, as far as the righteousness of God is concerned, it is not of the least consequence, whether this powerful cause be external or internal. In the upshot, it all amounts to the same thing. Man is under a moral necessity of becoming a sinner; and for this sin, the causes of which are entailed upon him, he must die. What is there in the imputation of the first man's sin, more unreasonable or unrighteous than this?

We will now consider this doctrine in its bearings on other doctrines connected with it; and we will make our remarks short, leaving it to the reader to fill up the outline.

1. According to this theory, which makes all sin to consist in *wrong choices*, and all holiness in right choices, it was impossible that man should have been created in the moral image of God, or in a state of holiness; for man must have had an existence before he could choose, and choosing was his own act, therefore he could not have been created in a holy state, but must have formed the holiness of his own character, by right choices. The causes of holiness, however, might have been created in him, or with him.

2. This theory is a complete denial of the doctrine of original sin, in all its parts, both imputed and inherent. We can scarcely acquit the reverend Professor of some want of candour, in what he writes about original sin, in one of his inferences, (see p. 27) where he says—"The subject may assist us in making a right explanation of original sin,"—and that "nothing can in truth be called original sin, but his first moral choice or preference being evil." But Professor F. knows as well as any one, that there never existed a heretick who denied original sin, according to this definition. For as

all men sin, there must be a *first* sin. Pelagius, if this be a correct definition, held the doctrine of original sin, as fully as Augustine; and much more *correctly*, if we receive this theory. But let men deal fairly with their readers—If they reject an old doctrine, let them not retain the name, as a blind to impose on the ignorant and unwary.

There is, indeed, one scheme on which original sin may consist with this new theory, and that is the opinion, that man is a moral agent in the womb, and puts forth *wrong choices* in the first moment of his conception: but Professor F. has excluded himself from the benefit of this theory, by his definition of sin, that it is "the violation of a known law;" for it will scarcely be contended that the newly formed *homunculus* has the knowledge of law; it might as well be supposed that he was a great philosopher, and understood all the laws of nature.

It was matter of surprise, therefore, to find the learned Professor, in one of his notes, (p. 45) hesitating, whether this might not be the true doctrine; at least refusing to express any opinion, and very formally recounting the reasons, *pro* and *con*. Unhappily, for him, however, he had prejudged the cause already. Whoever can adopt this theory, he cannot, while he maintains the fundamental proposition of his whole system. The conclusion is evident, therefore, that this theory subverts the doctrine of original sin, *in toto*.

3. If furnishes no reason why infants are subject to suffering and death. They are treated as sinners, while they are perfectly innocent. Let the advocates of this opinion exercise all their ingenuity to invent some more plausible reason for this procedure of the Divine government, than did Pelagius. If they can satisfactorily remove this difficulty from their system, we shall be disposed to think more favourably of it. But we are persuaded that this single fact will forever be fatal to every system, which denies that infants have sin imputed to them. And the Professor has not even noticed this difficulty; perhaps he judged it best to keep it out of view.

4. But if infants have no sin they have no need of redemption. Christ died only for sinners, therefore those infants that die before they become moral agents, have no part in the death of Christ; but are saved, if saved it all, without a Mediator; which is in direct contradiction to the scriptures, and the perpetual belief of the universal church.

5. On this principle, infants which die before they commit sin, have no need of regeneration by the Holy Spirit. They are not polluted with sin, and why should they be regenerated?

6. According to this theory, there is no meaning in baptism as applied to infants. This sacrament, undoubtedly is an emblem of the cleansing of the sin-polluted soul, by the washing of regeneration. Pelagius was not more gravelled by any objection made to his doctrine, than by this.

7. It is difficult to say what regeneration is, in adult sinners, according to this theory. Undoubtedly, it must remove the cause of evil volitions, or *wrong choices;* but what that cause is does not appear. If it is a defect in the soul itself, then it must be a new creation of the soul, as to its physical powers; but surely this is a strange notion of regeneration. But if the cause of the *wrong choice* is without us, then there is no need of any operation on the soul, but merely a change of external circumstances. The writer on human depravity, mentioned above, makes the supernatural agency of the Spirit necessary, to give force to motives and render them effectual; but why any supernatural agency should be deemed necessary upon his theory, we cannot understand. When the soul is in itself perfectly free from depravity, except what exists in its acts, there seems to be no manner of necessity for any Divine power to be exerted. All that is necessary is to present sufficient motives to the un-

derstanding, and this can be effected by external instruction, by means of the word, without any supernatural agency.

8. If this doctrine be true, then there is no more sin in the worst man living, when not engaged in moral action, than in the best. Judas Iscariot when asleep, had no more depravity in his heart, than the beloved John; or even than there was in the spotless human soul of Jesus itself!

9. According to this doctrine, it does not appear how there can be any such things as moral habits.

10. Two principles are assumed in these discourses which have no foundation in truth; the first is, that to suppose the soul itself to be stained with inherent depravity, is to make depravity a *physical thing*. But the truth is, moral principles can exist in the soul, when not exercised, just as well as intellectual faculties. True, if by *physical*, be understood that which is natural, then native depravity is physical; but if by it be meant something which is opposed to what is *moral*, then the assumption is false.

The other principle assumed without foundation in these discourses, is, that if one choice be wrong, all that follow it will be so, according to an ultimate law of our constitution. The author's words are—"Now, as it is an ultimate fact, that an original choice or preference of a wrong end or forbidden object does, itself, occasion the certainty of a continued train of evil choices by the agent, the total depravity of the agent, the original choice or first inclination of the will to evil, sustains towards the acts of the agent, as does no other, the relation of a primary influential cause of their being evil." (p. 29.) This is a new philosophy of the human mind; that if a moral agent make one wrong choice, it is a matter of constitutional necessity, that all consecutive acts should be evil also. It seems to have been invented for the occasion, to assist in harmonizing the new system; for thus, without any inherent principle of evil, total depravity can be accounted for. But this new dogma is contrary to all experience, and therefore ought to be rejected as false.

Finally, we close our examination of these discourses, by expressing our regret, that Professor Fitch has published on this subject so hastily. We are informed that he is yet a young man, and we think therefore that it would have been wise in him, to have revolved this theory in his mind, and to have discussed it with his friends, for half a score of years to come; for it is no very easy matter for a professor of theology to retract an opinion which he has once published to the world. Honour, interest, consistency, all are pledged, to go on defending what has once been uttered, *ex cathedra*. Few men have the magnanimity, or shall we call it humility, of an Augustine, a Luther, or a Baxter, to retract and refute their own errors.

We must also express our surprise and grief, that on the very spot, where we had supposed the sound theology of President Edwards had taken deeper root than any where else in the world, there should be promulgated, by men called orthodox, a system subversive of the radical principles of that great and good man!

A DISSERTATION ON THE MARRIAGE OF A MAN WITH HIS SISTER IN LAW. *By John H. Livingston, D.D. S.T.P. New Brunswick. Printed by Deare & Myer.* 1826. *pp.* 179; *octavo.*

THE DOCTRINE OF INCEST STATED; *with an examination of the question, Whether a Man may Marry his deceased Wife's Sister; in a Letter to a Clergyman of the Presbyterian Church; by Domesticus. Second edition, pp.* 48; *octavo.*

THE ARGUMENT OF DOMESTICUS, *on the question, Whether a Man may*

Marry his deceased Wife's Sister, considered in a Letter to a Clergyman of the Reformed Dutch Church. By Clericus. New York, W. E. Dean, Printer, 1827. *pp.* 25; *octavo.*

REMARKS ON THE LETTER OF DOMESTICUS, *containing the Doctrine of Incest stated; with an examination of the question, Whether a Man may Marry his deceased Wife's Sister. By Veritas. New York. Published by G. & C. Carvil,* 1827. *pp.* 40. 8*vo.*

ECCLESIASTICAL PROCEEDINGS, IN THE CASE OF MR. DONALD M'CRIMMON. *By Colin M'Iver, V. D. M. pp.* 42. 8*vo.*

CONSIDERATIONS *on the proposed erasure of Sect.* 4, *Chap.* XXIV. *of the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, which asserts, that "The man may not marry any of his wife's kindred, nearer in blood than he may of his own; nor the woman of her husband's kindred, nearer in blood than of her own." By Ezra Styles Ely, D. D.*

The subject of these publications is one which has for us no attractions; and as many folios as this review exhibits titles of pamphlets might have been published, in relation to it, without any notice from us, if the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church had not seen meet to make an order, which seemed to call our attention to it as a matter of duty. In the discharge of this duty, unpleasant as we have found it, we have not only pretty carefully perused all the publications mentioned at the head of this article, but a good deal more. We knew that in the time of Henry VIII. of England, who had married his brother's widow, all the learning of Europe was put in requisition to throw light on this subject. We therefore, among other things, looked over Hume's* History of England, to revive our recollections; and we think it may not be amiss to lay before our readers a few quotations from that historian, and afterwards to continue a historical view of the subject (of a very general kind however) from the period of the Reformation to the present time.

It will be recollected that Pope Julius had granted a dispensation to Henry to marry the wife of his deceased brother; and that his successor, Clement, could never be prevailed on to disannul the marriage—Not, it was sufficiently evident, from any conscientious scruples, with which he appears never to have been much troubled, but altogether from political considerations.

"Henry," says Hume, "affirmed that his scruples arose entirely from private reflection; and that, on consulting his confessor the Bishop of Lincoln, he found the prelate possessed with the same doubts and difficulties. The king himself being so great a casuist and divine, next proceeded to examine the question more carefully by his own learning and study; and having recourse to Thomas, of Aquine, he observed that this celebrated doctor, whose authority was great in the church, and absolute with him, had treated of that very case, and had expressly declared against the lawfulness of such marriages.* The prohibitions, said Thomas, contained in Leviticus, and among the rest that of marrying a brother's widow, are moral, eternal, and founded on a divine sanction; and though the pope may dispense with the rules of the church, the laws of God cannot be set aside by authority less than that which enacted them. The Archbishop of Canterbury was then applied to; and he was required to consult his brethren: All the prelates of England, except

* Hume is a writer whom, on certain subjects, we should never quote as an authority. If we recollect rightly, it was the celebrated Charles Fox who said of Hume and Gibbon, "that the first loved a king, and both hated a priest, so much, that they were never to be trusted, when a king or a priest was the subject." But the prejudices of Hume do not appear to have had influence in what he records as a historian, on the topick under consideration. When he takes occasion to deliver his own views, he shows, as usual, his total disregard of revelation. But his historical statements are the less to be suspected, because they contravene his own opinions.

* Burnet, Fiddes.

Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, unanimously declared, under their hand and seal, that they deemed the king's marriage unlawful."*

Hume in the course of his narrative professes to examine "the question of Henry's marriage with Catherine, by the principles of sound philosophy, exempt from superstition," and declares that "it seemed not liable to much difficulty." After entering into a detail of reasons to show that the king's scruples were unnecessary, he adds—

"But, in opposition to these reasons, and many more which might be collected, Henry had custom and precedent on his side; the principle by which men are almost wholly governed in their actions and opinions. The marrying of a brother's widow was so unusual, that no other instance of it could be found in any history or record of any Christian nation; and though the popes were accustomed to dispense with more essential precepts of morality, and even permitted marriages within other prohibited degrees, such as those of uncle and niece, the imaginations of men were not yet reconciled to this particular exercise of his authority. Several universities of Europe, therefore, without hesitation, as well as without interest or reward,† gave verdict in the king's favour; not only those of France, Paris, Orleans, Bourges, Toulouse, Angiers, which might be supposed to lie under the influence of their prince, ally to Henry; but also those of Italy, Venice, Ferrara, Padua; even Bologna itself, though under the immediate jurisdiction of Clement. Oxford alone,‡ and Cambridge,§ made some difficulty; because these universities, alarmed at the progress of Lutheranism, and dreading a defection from the holy see, scrupled to give their sanction to measures whose consequences they feared would prove fatal to the ancient religion. Their opinion, however, conformable to that of the other universities of Europe, was at last obtained; and the king, in order to give more weight to all these authorities, engaged his nobility to write a letter to the pope, recommending his cause to the holy father, and threatening him with the most dangerous consequences in case of a denial of justice." The convocation too, both of Canterbury and York, pronounced the king's marriage invalid, irregular, and contrary to the law of God, with which no human power had authority to dispense."†

Another quotation and we shall have nearly done with Mr. Hume. Speaking of the Parliament which sat in 1532, he says—

"It is remarkable that one Temse ventured this session to move, that the house should address the king to take back the queen, and stop the prosecution of his divorce. This motion made the king send for Audley the speaker; and explain to him the scruples with which his conscience had long been burdened; scruples, he said, which had proceeded from no wanton appetite, which had arisen after the fervours of youth were past, and which were confirmed by the concurring sentiments of all the learned societies in Europe. Except in Spain and Portugal, he added, it was never heard of that any man had espoused two sisters; but he himself had the misfortune, he believed, to be the first Christian man that had ever married his brother's widow."‡

All who are acquainted with the character of Henry VIII. know that when he wished to get rid of a wife —and he had not less than four that he did wish to get rid of—he was never at a loss for means to accomplish his purpose. Death or divorce, as the one or the other might seem most expedient at the time, was speedily made the instrument to dissever the marriage bond, by which the reckless tyrant was bound to his unhappy consort. The opinions and the professed feelings of such a man, when standing by themselves, would certainly with us stand for nothing. They stand for nothing in the present case, farther than as they corresponded with those of abler and better men; although the Eighth Henry of England had, questionless, more talent and more learning than one monarch of a thousand. But what he said to the speaker of the House of Commons, as given in the

* Burnet, vol i. p. 38. Stowe, p. 548.
† Herbert. Burnet.
‡ Wood, Hist. and Ant. Ox. lib. i. p. 225.
§ Burnet, vol. i. p. 6.

* Rymer, vol. xiv. 405. Burnet, vol. i. p. 95.
† Rymer, vol. xiv. p. 456. 472.

last quotation, was as he declared, and as is confirmed by a preceding quotation, the fair result of reports and decisions from the most learned universities and individuals of Europe, in his case. We wish that the last quoted sentence from Hume may be particularly noted; because it contains what we believe to be the exact truth, and for the sake of which our whole reference to this case has been made. It has been made to show what was the state of publick opinion, in regard to the subject before us, throughout the whole of Christendom, at the period of the Protestant reformation. It was known then, as it is known now, that in ancient Persia and Egypt, pagan princes, esteeming it a degradation to marry either with their own subjects or with the royal families of other nations, had espoused their nearest relatives; and that Vortigern, king of South Britain, while Britain was yet Pagan, had married his own daughter. But this heathenish and abominable incest, and all approximation to it, had always, and with entire unanimity, been regarded with horror by all Christians, from the earliest days of the church up to that time. At one period, indeed, the church had gone far to the other extreme, and made it incest to marry within the seventh degree, either of consanguinity or affinity. But to marry within the fourth was, as Henry asserted, unheard of; except that in Spain and Portugal* there had been some instances of a man espousing two sisters. This however had always been done by a dispensation from the Pope, whose power was not only denied and disregarded by Protestants, but in this matter seems to have been much questioned, even by many staunch Romanists—That the Pope could not legalize the marriage of two brothers with the same woman, was the very case, on which the voice of learning and religion throughout Europe had been given against him.

Let us now see how this subject has been viewed by the whole body of European Protestants, ever since the separation from the Romish church. As speedily as practicable, after the reformation, the Protestant churches severally drew up and published Formularies, or Articles, of their Faith. The collection of these, which has been made, and published in Latin, not being just now at hand, we avail ourselves of the labours of the venerable man, lately deceased, who published, about ten years since, the work whose title stands first at the head of this review. The profound learning, fervent piety, and scrupulous conscientiousness of Dr. Livingston, afford an ample pledge for the verity and accuracy of his statements. After showing that

* The abject subjection of Spain and Portugal to Romish superstition and papal authority, beyond any other countries of Europe, is well known. Portugal has long exhibited the most disgusting examples of incestuous marriages. Near the close of the 17th century, the very case occurred for which John the Baptist reproved Herod. We have the following record, in relation to Alphonso, King of Portugal, and his brother, Don Peter. "Alphonso's wife having transferred her affections to Don Peter, a circumstance which had led her to induce her husband to submit to the resignation [of his crown], their marriage having been declared null by the chapter of Lisbon, and the regent having gained a papal dispensation, and the consent of the states, married the lady who had been his brother's wife. On the death of Alphonso, the regent succeeded by the title of Peter II."—*Article Portugal, in New Edinburgh Encyclopædia.* "Joseph, who died in 1777, having left no sons, was succeeded by his daughter Mary, whom he had married, by dispensation from the Pope, to Don Peter, her uncle, with a view of preventing the crown from falling into a foreign family."—*Ibid.* "The Prince of Brazil, the son of that incestuous marriage, is wedded to his aunt."—*Buck's Theological Dictionary, Article Incest.* Here we have not only an uncle marrying his niece, but a nephew marrying his aunt. The late contract of marriage between Don Miguel and his niece, the daughter of the Emperor of Brazil, shows that royal incest is still as fashionable as ever in Portugal.

not only the early fathers of the Christian church, both Greek and Latin, in the works which they published as individuals, but also in the decrees of several ecclesiastical councils formed under their influence, were unanimous in condemning as incestuous, marriages within the usually prohibited degrees; and that the Romish church, agreeably to what we have already seen, had ever done the same, he adds—

"Among the celebrated reformers there was not a dissenting voice. They were explicit and unanimous upon the subject.* Zuinglius, in a letter to Grineus, enlarges upon four points, asserting —1. That although civil magistrates should tolerate such marriages, yet no power on earth can render void the law of God. 2. That the apostles made no new law respecting marriage, under the gospel, but left this article as they found it. 3. That marrying within near degrees was abhorred by the Greeks and other civilized heathen. And, 4. That such marriages, being against the law of God, ought to be dissolved.

"The sentiments of Calvin may be satisfactorily gathered from two of his letters. One is supposed, from the closing paragraph, to have been written to Grineus. Of the other, it is uncertain to whom it was addressed. They are both to be found in the collection of his epistles. In the first he writes: 'It must be maintained that the prohibition, respecting sisters in law, is one of those, which time nor place can never abrogate. It proceeds from the very fountain of nature, and is founded upon the general principle of all laws, which is perpetual and inviolable.—When the emperor Claudius obtained the sanction of the senate to remove the opprobrium of his incestuous marriage with Agrippina, there was none found to imitate his example, excepting only one liberated slave. I mention this to show how inviolable the law of nature is, even among profane nations.—Let the examples drawn from the heathen, if in virtue and modesty they should appear to exceed us, make us ashamed.—Indeed to me, this single admonition of Paul is sufficient: 'Whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things.'

"In the other letter, Calvin says: 'It is sufficiently known in what degrees of *consanguinity*, God in his law forbids marriage.—What relates to the degrees of *affinity* is equally obvious. There are some who dispute, or rather cavil, whether it is not lawful for a man to take the sister of his deceased wife; and they seize, as a pretext, upon the words, Levit. xviii. 18. *during her life time.* But their error is refuted by the very words of that text. Because what is there condemned by Moses, is not for incest, but for cruelty to the wife. That text actually respects polygamy.'

"Ecolampadius, in a letter dated 1531, asserted: 'That the law in Leviticus did bind all mankind; and that the law in Deuteronomy respecting a brother's marrying his sister-in-law was a dispensation of God to his own law, which dispensation belonged only to the Jews.'—Similar citations might be made from the writings of Beza, Bullinger, Ursinus, Musculus, and others, who were eminent for their profound erudition and exemplary piety, in the reformed cantons of Switzerland, in Geneva, and on the Rhine. * * *

"All the Protestant churches have uniformly considered, and unequivocally maintained, a marriage with a sister-in-law to be incestuous. A few documents respecting the principal denominations, will abundantly illustrate and confirm this assertion.

The sentiments of the Lutheran church are accurately expressed by those celebrated divines, who, in the name of their church, replied to the inquiry, made by Henry VIII., whether it was lawful for a man to marry his sister-in-law? In their famous Letter, they prove the law of Levit. xviii. to be of universal obligation, and adopt the most forcible language in reprobating such marriages. They close by saying; 'It is manifest, and cannot be denied, that the law of Levit. xviii. prohibits a marriage with a sister-in-law—this is to be considered as a divine, a natural, and a moral law, against which no other law may be enacted, or established. Agreeably to this, the whole church has always retained this law, and judged such marriages to be incestuous. Agreeably to this also, the decrees of synods, the cele-

* "Melancthon, with his characteristic modesty, declined to give his opinion upon the question, when requested by Henry VIII., from which, it has been suggested that he differed from his brethren in this article. But as he afterwards joined with the Lutheran divines in their decision upon that subject, he cannot be considered to have maintained opposite sentiments.—A similar conclusion may perhaps also apply to Bucer.

brated opinions of the most holy fathers, and even the civil laws, prohibit such marriages, and pronounce them to be incestuous. Wherefore we also judge that this law is to be preserved in all the churches, as a divine, a natural, and a moral law; nor will we dispense with, or permit in our churches, that such marriages shall be contracted; and this doctrine we can, and as God shall enable us, we will resolutely defend.'

"In an exposition of the *Augsburg confession of faith*, by a learned Danish divine, the opinion of the Lutheran church respecting this article, is thus expressed, 'whoever is inclined and resolved to enter into the matrimonial state, ought to begin in the fear of God; and to look out for a person who is not nearly related to him, either *in blood* or *by marriage*—see Levit. xviii. and xx., and here, let it be observed, that where a man is forbidden to marry any near of kin, there the female is understood to be equally prohibited, in the same degree of relation, although the woman be not mentioned. So Levit. xviii. 14, *thou shalt not approach thy father's brother's wife*, includes also the mother's brother's wife. So consequently, no woman may take *her sister's husband*, for the relation of a brother's wife and of a sister's husband are exactly in the same degrees.'

"A celebrated Lutheran civilian says, 'wherever a marriage is contracted within a degree prohibited by the divine law; for instance, if a man should marry the sister of his deceased wife, there such marriage is incestuous, and ought not to be deemed a legitimate union, but stigmatised as an impure mixture. It cannot be palliated by any dispensation, but ought to be rescinded; and the contracting parties, notwithstanding they may plead ignorance, should be punished by the magistrate. Human laws may not contravene the divine authority, nor can an inferior magistrate dispense with the precepts of the supreme Lawgiver.' *F. Balduin. Lib.* iv. *cap.* 13. *de cas. cons.*

"The Church of England has always most strictly adhered to the table of prohibited marriages, agreeably to Lev. xviii. as published by authority and found in most of the English editions of the Bible. Among other degrees forbidden in the male branch, is art. 17. 'A man may not marry his *wife's sister;*' in the female, art. 18. 'a woman may not marry her *sister's husband.*' That every marriage within these prohibited degrees, will, by the canon law of England, subject the parties to severe penalties, and to immediate excommunication from the church, is well known. * * * *

"The Church of Scotland appears to have been so deeply impressed with a conviction of the enormous evil of incest that she has introduced the subject even into her confession of faith, and fixed the principles of prohibited degrees, in language the most intelligible and decided.

* * * *

"The Church of Scotland adopted the standards established by the Westminster assembly of divines. What that assembly judged of Levit. xviii. 18, may be ascertained from the remarks made upon that text, by those learned men who were appointed by *the committee for religion* to make annotations upon the Bible.—'Verse 18. *To her sister.* This is to be understood, not of *two sisters*, one after another to wife, the latter upon the death of the former, for the marriage of a brother's wife is forbidden before, verse 16, and by consequence a woman must not marry *her sister's husband;* and so two sisters are already forbidden to be married to one man, verse 16; wherefore, this verse 18, is a prohibition of polygamy, that is, of having more wives than one at once, and the reason sheweth it, that the one may not be *a vexation* to the other.—The word *sister* in a general acceptation may be applied to any woman, as the word *brother* to any man, Gen. xix. 7. And it is to be noted, that it is sometimes applied to things, which in propriety of speech, come not under such a title or denomination; as the wings of the beast, Ezek. i. 9, are said to touch *a woman to her sister*, as the Hebrew phraseth it, see Exod. xxvi. 3.'

"The construction which the Reformed Dutch Church puts upon Levit. xviii., verse 16, is evident from the marginal notes, which the translators, who were appointed by the national synod of Dortrecht held 1618 and 1619, have annexed to that text.

"'From this law it necessarily follows, that a woman who has been married with one brother, may not, after his death, marry with the other brother; and upon the same principle, a man who has been married to one sister, may not after her death, marry the other sister.'—See their note upon verse 18.

"It consequently can by no means, from this be concluded, that the husband, *after the death* of his wife, may marry her sister.'

The Reformed Church is established by law in Holland, and is consequently the National Church. Her canons are therefore recognised by the civil government, and made the laws of the state.

Dr. L. then inserts at length, the canon which relates to marriages, in which the prohibited degrees are particularly specified, and within

which, whoever marries shall, it is said, be "declared infamous, and subjected to corporal punishment and fine." We cannot afford room for this extended canon, but we will insert the note with which Dr. L. concludes this part of his dissertation.

"The writer of this dissertation recollects, that while in Europe, he received information by letters, of a member of the church having married the sister of his deceased wife; a case which was the first that was recollected to have happened in America, and which excited great uneasiness. The informed communicated this to an eminent minister, (Professor H.) and asked him, how the Church of Holland would proceed in such a case? To which he replied: "It is a case which cannot happen in Holland. It is forbidden by the canons of the church, and by the civil laws of the state. Any minister who knowingly solemnised such a marriage would be instantly deposed; the incestuous connexion would be declared null and void; and the parties severely punished."

We have now seen that from the very origin of the Christian church to the present hour, European Christendom, Protestant as well as Popish, has, with entire unanimity, condemned all marriages within the fourth degree either of affinity or consanguinity; and also that the penalties inflicted for incestuous marriages, both by church and state, remain in full force. We have likewise incidentally seen that the laws or usages of the more refined heathen nations, have commonly been in conformity with the same rule. It should likewise be particularly noted, that in regard to the interpretation of Lev. xviii. 18, there appear to have been, in almost every age of the church, a few individuals, who have *questioned*, whether there is not here an intimation that after the decease of a wife, a man might lawfully marry her sister. But we are not aware of more than one* instance of a man, of any note in the European church, who has expressed a *clear opinion* that this verse contains an allowance of such a marriage; and nothing is more evident than that all *leaning* of individuals towards such an interpretation, has been withstood by an overwhelming majority of the most learned and pious commentators, as well as by all the publick formularies and canons of the different churches—It may be added, that the Jewish commentators have agreed with the Christian in this interpretation. Dr. Livingston (p. 119) says—"The sister of a deceased wife is, without any possible exemption, absolutely and forever prohibited—In this sense the ancient Jews understood the law. They knew they were unconditionally forbidden to marry the sister of a deceased wife. The law is unequivocal, and as it regards the Jews, its meaning cannot be controverted. The only question to be decided is, whether this law is ceremonial and peculiar to Israel; or whether it is moral and of universal obligation? That it cannot be ceremonial is evident, from its possessing none of the properties of a ceremonial law. That it is a moral law is certain—from its essential connexion, in its object and scope, with the seventh precept of the Decalogue—from its express reference to the law of nature, and coincidence with that very law which the wicked inhabitants of Canaan had trangressed; and from its being the only written law in the whole Bible, upon the subject of incest; the only standard by which the Christian church can ascertain the crime, and agreeably to which, by proper discipline, she can preserve her purity by excommunicating such criminals."

From the historical review then, thus far taken, it appears that if the Presbyterian Church shall remove from her Confession of Faith the section which has been referred to the presbyteries, and thereby sanction, as she of course will, the doctrine that "a man may marry *some* of his wife's kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own, and a woman some of

* Dr. Adam Clark: See his Commentary on Lev. xviii. 18. But he gives a mere *dictum*, without any argument.

her husband's kindred nearer in blood than her own," she will set her opinion in direct opposition to the opinion of all Christian churches in Europe from the time of the Apostles; and to all the most approved commentators of scripture, to all Jewish usage, and to all the best heathen* moralists and jurists. We do not say that this is absolutely decisive of the question in controversy. But we do say, that the Presbyterian church ought to be well aware of the ground on which she treads in this business. We do say that the presbyteries of this denomination ought, from a regard both to conscience and character, to be entirely satisfied that the word of God will clearly bear them out in repealing, if they do repeal, that part of their constitution, which is submitted to them for consideration.

Let us now trace the history of this business in our own country, and particularly in the church which at present is most immediately concerned. The eighty-six presbyteries, now under the care of the General Assembly, sprang from a single one, consisting of five or six ministers, which was formed in Philadelphia, A. D. 1706. In ten years, the number of members had so much increased, and the places of their residence were so widely distant from each other, that it became expedient to form four Presbyteries out of one. This was accordingly done, and the first Synod of this church met in Philadelphia in the autumn of 1717. At this very first Synod a record was made in relation to the subject before us, of which the following is an exact copy—"The affair of Andrew Van Dyke, that was referred from the Presbytery of New Castle to the Synod, came under consideration; and a considerable time being spent in discoursing upon it, it was determined, nemine contradicente, that his marriage with his brother's wife or widow, was incestuous or unlawful; and their living together as the consequence of that marriage is incestuous and unlawful, and that so long as they live together, they be debarred from all sealing ordinances; and that Mr. Wotherspoon make intimation hereof to his congregation, in what time and manner he shall think convenient." As nothing afterwards appears on the synodical records in reference to this case, there is reason to believe that Van Dyke and his wife lived and died in a state of exclusion "from all sealing ordinances." We remark, in passing, that the above record shows that one statement made by Dr. Ely, in the little pamphlet under review, is not exactly correct. He says, (page 11)—"Some would erase from the Confession the words in question, because they have been the constant occasion of controversy in the church; and the highest judicatory of the Presbyterian church in the United States has *never* been able to satisfy itself, that the marriage of a deceased wife's sister is positively forbidden in the Bible." It was not indeed in regard to a wife's sister, but to a brother's wife, that the above decision was made; yet we have no reason to believe that the Synod that made the decision, and which was then "the highest judicatory of the Presbyterian church in the United States," did not regard these cases as perfectly parallel. So they unquestionably did regard them, and without a single dissenting voice, they pronounced the case before them one of such gross incest, as to preclude the parties from all sealing ordinances, while the unlawful connexion should continue. We ought however in candour to mention, that we suspect the book of records which contains the minute we have exhibited, has never been in possession of Dr. Ely, and that he did not know

* An Arabian writer, cited by Pocock, says—"Turpissimum eorum quæ faciebant, (Arabes tempore ignorantiæ) erat hoc, quod vir duas sorores et patris sui uxorem, valut successor, assumeret." See Poole's Synopsis, on Lev. xviii. 16, where several other quotations, of similar import, from heathen writers, Greek and Latin, are given.

of the existence of this minute—The decision specified appears to have had a very salutary effect. It prevented, for a considerable number of years, a "constant controversy in the church," which Dr. Ely justly states as having existed since that time. The book from which we have taken the foregoing extract, contains the records of the Synod to the end of the year 1726—and there is not during this time (the space of nine years) a single indication that any other case of the kind had ever disturbed the peace of the church. The book of synodical records from 1727 to 1757, both years inclusive, is most unhappily lost, we fear beyond the hope of recovery. It was during this period, in the year 1741, that a wide and lamentable rent took place in the Synod of Philadelphia. Two rival and hostile synods were formed, one retaining the name of the Synod of Philadelphia, and the other assuming that of the Synod of New York. They united again in the year 1758, under the title, or appellation, of The Synod of New York and Philadelphia; and so remained till the formation of the General Assembly, which met for the first time in 1789. The book which contained the proceedings of the Synod of Philadelphia before the separation (from 1726 to 1741) and during the separation (from 1741 to 1758) is that which is lost.—The Synod book of the Synod of New York, during the separation, is preserved. But although from the loss of records we cannot state with certainty how much, or how little, the Synod had to do with questions relative to unlawful marriages for the space of more than thirty years, it seems probable, from what we afterwards meet with, that the decision in the case of Van Dyke governed the churches through the whole of that period. Two years after the union of the synods, that is in the year 1760, we find the subsequent minutes in regard to this subject. They are in the following words—"The case of conscience concerning a man's having married his half-brother's widow, was brought under consideration, and several members offered their thoughts on it. But the further consideration was deferred till the afternoon.—The case of the marriage resumed. After some farther conversation on this point, agreed that Messrs. Samuel Finley, James Finley, Blair, Miller, Kittletas, and Gilbert Tennant, be a committee to bring in a sum of what they can find in scripture and the English law on that point, against Monday's afternoon; and also on a second case from Donnegal Presbytery, where a brother's and sister's relicts married together; and on a third case, of a man's marrying two sisters, one after the other's death.—The case of conscience resumed, and the committee appointed to examine what the English and Levitical laws have determined in this affair, brought in their report. Voted that the consideration of the above affair be deferred until next Synod, and that it be recommended to the several members to examine the affair more thoroughly before that time, and give their sentiments on it." In the following year, 1761, we have this minute in relation to the preceding cases—"The cases of conscience respecting marriage were resumed, and after the most mature deliberation, the Synod judge as follows;—That as the Levitical law, enforced also by the civil laws of the land, is the only rule by which we are to judge of marriages, whoever marry within the degrees of prohibited consanguinity or affinity forbidden therein, act unlawfully, and have no right to the distinguishing privileges of the churches; and as the marriages in question appear to be within the prohibited degrees, they are to be accounted unlawful, and the persons suspended from special communion, while they continue in this relation." Here let it be carefully noted, that the marriage of a deceased wife's sister, as well as that of a man with his deceased brother's widow, had been submitted to the consideration of the Synod; and that after

solemn deliberation, and the report of the ablest committee that could be selected, and the private inquiries and researches of the members for a whole year, and "the most mature deliberation" of a second synod, both these kinds of marriages are declared "to be unlawful, and that the persons contracting them are to be suspended from special communion, while they continue in this relation." Surely it ought not to be asserted that the highest judicatory of the Presbyterian church, has *never* been able to satisfy itself that the marriage of a deceased wife's sister is positively forbidden in the Bible. The highest judicature of this church was perfectly satisfied on this subject, for more than half a century. But here again we ought to acquit Dr. Ely of known misrepresentation—We are persuaded he was not acquainted with this decision. His quotations are all made from acts of the General Assembly, which certainly are of a different complexion from those of the old synod—the synod which formed and sanctioned the present constitution of the Presbyterian church. Yet in no instance, let it be remembered, has the General Assembly failed to frown, and sometimes very severely, on these marriages. We did intend to trace this subject through all the records of the General Synod, and General Assembly. But we find that the execution of that purpose would extend our review beyond all reasonable bounds. The truth is, that in the Presbyterian church, discipline in regard to unlawful marriages has gradually been relaxed, and that this relaxation has been, in a great measure, owing to the manner in which the General Assembly has treated the subject—till in some parts of the church no discipline at all is exercised, and the General Assembly itself, has at last submitted it to the Presbyteries to decide whether the constitutional article shall not be repealed.

To what is this to be attributed? To the gradual increase of light, and the removal of superstition—say the advocates for curtailing the Confession of Faith. To a growing deterioration of morals, and a criminal relaxation of church discipline, and the repeal or non execution of the laws against incest—answer those who would preserve the constitution in its integrity. We profess to belong to the latter class; and thus we come into collision with the authors of the two pamphlets, to which are attached the signatures of Clericus and Veritas. These pamphlets, in reply to Domesticus, are written in a neat style, and with good temper.

We have said that our opinions are in collision with those of these writers; but this is true only to a certain extent. They wish the canons of the church,* which relate to unlawful marriages to be repealed or altered; we wish that they should remain exactly as they are. But we entirely agree with them in thinking that the ground is utterly untenable, on which Domesticus contends against an alteration in the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian church. We think that he has deeply injured the cause which he professes to defend; and we propose to quote from Clericus and Veritas in proof of this fact. So far then as these writers state considerations to show that we must take our authority for the prohibition of incestuous marriages from the Levitical code, and not, as Domesticus would have it, from "general expediency"—so far as they expose the weakness and futility of all his reasoning in support of his strange hypothesis—so far as they condemn his extravagance of assertion and expression—so far their

* These writers, it appears, both belong to the communion of the Dutch church, before the General Synod of which the very same question is now pending, as before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church.

sentiments and ours are in perfect accordance; and we only regret that Domesticus has put it in their power to urge against what we esteem a good cause, the indiscreet admissions of one of its advocates. All that we have to say, therefore, in opposition to Clericus and Veritas, may be brought within a narrow compass; for by far the larger part of their pamphlets is employed in exposing what is inconclusive and objectionable in the publication to which they reply. If we rightly apprehend these writers, they wish the canons of the Dutch church and the Confession of the Presbyterian church to be altered, in regard to unlawful marriages—simply and solely because they think that these canons and this Confession, as they now stand, cannot be supported by the Levitical code, nor by any other scriptural authority. We have honestly and carefully endeavoured to understand them, and if we do, the whole of what they say on the merits of the question in controversy comes in the result to this—We are by no means to reject the xviii. chapter of Leviticus as containing merely a temporary enactment for the Jews, but to regard it as furnishing, on the subject of unlawful marriages, the law of the Christian church: and yet we are not to infer from the 16th verse of that chapter, that a man is forbidden to marry the sister of his deceased wife, but rather to consider the 18th verse as intimating that he may. Now we have already seen, that while there have been in every age of the Christian church a few individuals, some of them, we admit, learned and pious, who have rather leaned to this interpretation of the 16th and 18th verses of the xviii. chapter of Leviticus than decisively adopted it, still the collected and overwhelming weight of piety and learning have always been decisively in favour of the other interpretation; and nearly the whole, even of those who lean to the opposite side, have admitted that our's is the safest construction for practice; the best calculated to preserve the purity of the church from contamination, and the consciences of its members from uneasy doubts and suspicions. Nay, C. and V. themselves disclaim expressly the imputation of pleading for these marriages, as generally expedient; or indeed of being advocates for them at all—They only wish the rules of the church to be so modified that, for the present, some slight punishment may be inflicted for the violation of existing prejudices; and Clericus says, expressly, (page 17), "In a few years the prejudice will probably subside: publick opinion may change; and it may *appear expedient* to dispense even with *this slight discipline.*" How these writers are to show that they are consistent with themselves, in the different parts of their pamphlets, we are glad to think is not a task which we are called to undertake.

But let us see what reasons they assign for the interpretation they would give to the 16th and 18th verses of Lev. xviii. And here we wish it may be well noted that they do not even pretend to allege any new argument, from the meaning of the texts in the original, or from the context of the verses—they do not even recite much that has heretofore been said by others, in favour of their opinion. What they do say, in the way of argument, has been said and answered a hundred times, before they were born. Their whole plea, so far as it is properly their own, rests on the increased light of the present age, on classing the opinions of their opponents with those in favour of religious persecution and witchcraft, and on the fact that persons of great piety and worth have actually contracted such marriages as we judge to be unlawful. Now we really think that we might fairly urge that much of all this is *gratis dictum*, and that the

rest is set aside by a fundamental principle of dialectick, which says, *a particulari ad generale non valet consequentia*—You shall not draw a general conclusion from particular cases. What has the increased light of the present age to do with the subject, if the present age has not thrown a single ray of new light on the texts of scripture in controversy? Such we affirm to be the fact; and Clericus and Veritas themselves do not profess to show the contrary. And what have religious persecution and witchcraft to do with the question, if there is no similarity between them and the case in hand. Clericus has only intimated, he has not even attempted to prove, that there is a similarity. We affirm that there is none whatever. No Protestant, no Romanist, so far as we know, pretends to allege that there is any passage of scripture that lays down a law, showing *in what cases* religious persecution is lawful, and in what cases unlawful. But these gentlemen themselves admit that there is a passage of scripture which lays down the law in regard to unlawful marriages—The only question is about the true interpretation of this law, and C. and V. *take it for granted*, that the light of this age is in favour of their construction. Even in this, facts are all against them, unless they will maintain that the light of the age has begun to dawn very recently—perhaps since they and Domesticus have appeared as authors. We are not aware that any late European publications have shed light on this subject: and as to our own country, what writers, we ask, of the present age, have ranked higher in point of learning, piety and logical acumen, among the Congregational churches of New England, than Dr. Trumbull and the younger President Edwards? And who, in the Dutch and Presbyterian churches, have been more distinguished by the union of the same talents than Doctors Livingston and Mason? Yet all these men have most decisively opposed the interpretation for which C. and V. are advocates, and have put forth all their strength in favour of our opinion, and in opposition to theirs. We know not why C. and V. have not condescended so much as to mention the work of Dr. Livingston—especially as they belong to the church of which, for half a century, he was the brightest ornament. Whatever may have been the cause of their silence, as well as that of Domesticus, we shall take this opportunity to say explicitly, that we think he had, by a very great disparity, more learning, more theological knowledge, more logick, and a better acquaintance with biblical criticism, than all of them put together, with the present reviewer added to the number. But perhaps he was so *indurated* by years, that the light of the present age could not penetrate his mind! Seriously, for this is a very serious subject, we do not believe that it has been *light*, but *corrupt feeling*, unrestrained by church discipline and civil law, which has led to the wretched frequency of marriages between brothers and sisters-in-law, in our country—For in other countries there has been nothing of the kind—unless we except France, in the time of the revolution. How will *Veritas* himself reconcile the whole scope of his pamphlet with the following paragraph found on the 11th page? He says—

"I would not, however, on any consideration, be understood as undervaluing these excellent standards of doctrine which we have received from, and for which we are indebted to, the piety and learning of our ancestors; or as casting any reflection on their pious care, in training up their children, from their infancy, in doctrinal knowledge, and a strict regard for the institutions and ordinances of religion. We have rather reason to mourn over the degeneracy of modern times. Would that this hallowed influence were distilling itself more extensively on our rising generation! Let the young be taught to venerate our confes-

sions of faith. Let early instruction in their doctrines have its full effect. It may possibly produce prejudice, but better that should be the result, than that its total neglect should leave the mind unoccupied, and unguarded against the inroads of infidelity and error: for, where faithfully administered, if the subject is diverted to either, he will step over on the sterner side of Christian rectitude.

Yes, verily, "we have reason to mourn over the degeneracy of modern times," and to impute to this cause the better state of the church and of society at large, in years that are past. To this cause, and not to increased light, we are to impute the transgressions of a *few*, not *many*, pious persons, in the matter of unlawful marriage. The very truth is, and all history proves it, that in no one point of morals are good men themselves so liable to offend, if not restrained by the strongest and most palpable bonds, as in that which relates to the intercourse of the sexes. We do not believe that there is in the United States at present, a holier man than David, or a wiser one than Solomon. Yet every reader of the Bible knows how lamentably they sinned, by the indulgence of unhallowed propensities, and what a blot they have left on their characters, as a warning to all succeeding ages. Nor ought it to be forgotten, how severely they suffered, by the immediate inflictions of God himself. As to witchcraft, the light of modern times, it is supposed, has discovered that, at present, there is no such thing; and consequently that there is no passage of scripture, however applicable heretofore, that is applicable now. But this modern light, even in the judgment of Clericus and Veritas, has not discovered that there is no passage of scripture which is directly applicable to unlawful marriages. They maintain that there is such a passage. They maintain it stoutly against Domesticus; who seems to think indeed that he has a complete monopoly of this wonderful light—this (to use a figure of his own) "Jack-with-a-lantern," which has led him away from the safe and sure paths of holy scripture, and "soused him into bogs and ditches," in one of which Veritas professes to have found him, and to enjoy a laugh at his expense.

Thus are we brought into closer contact with Domesticus, certainly the most singular writer that we ever encountered. He uses no ceremony with any body, and therefore has no right to expect any in return. He hurls aside with a jerk, all the best expositors of scripture, and all the framers of canons and confessions of faith, in every age of the church, who have thought that, for the law of incest, recourse must be had to the 18th chapter of Leviticus. He treats them all with perfect contempt, and in reference to the basis on which they construct their system he says—"As well might a man endeavour to persuade us, that a steam-engine is made to boil water for the tea-table." Now, a writer who can do this, may be learned, may be ingenious, may be eloquent, may be brilliant, but in our poor opinion, he discovers more talent for every thing that is the opposite of modesty, than for any thing else. Domesticus professes to be on our side of the question, but as an auxiliary we renounce him utterly.

Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis,
Tempus eget——

He has done all in his power to betray our cause to the enemy. Not that he has done this intentionally—we acquit him of design; but he has done it in fact. The proof is before us. Clericus quotes him exultingly, from the beginning to the end of his letter; and Veritas frequently refers to him in the same way. Clericus says—

"Now, I ask, what is the argument of Domesticus? Indulge me, my friend, with a rapid view of it, to show the correctness of my averment.

"The divine law he yields *in toto*, at the very outset, as giving no direct or

positive countenance to the side he has undertaken to defend. This is his language: 'My conviction of the incestuous nature of the marriage of a wife's sister, is, as I have already hinted, not founded on the *letter* of the Levitical law. On this point I fully agree with the gentlemen alluded to above;' (referring to those who had been represented by his friend as denying the relation of the 18th verse of the 18th chapter of Leviticus to the question, and thinking the constructive reasoning from the 16th verse, which forbids the marriage of a woman with her husband's brother, too vague and indeterminate to build a solid conclusion on.) 'I can no more find it prohibited in the words of that code, than I can find the battle of Waterloo in the Apocalypse of St. John.' Again. 'The question is, are they' (the institutions of Moses,) 'obligatory on the Christian church, or on Christian nations as a system, so that no change can be made in any, even of the details, without incurring the high guilt of rebellion against the authority of Almighty God? Every sensible man will answer without hesitation, no. I then ask how much is obligatory? What rule is to direct us in the delicate process of sifting and selection? The obvious reply to this is, just so much as agrees with the physical, moral, and political circumstances of modern society, and the rule is GENERAL EXPEDIENCY as apprehended by the common sense of mankind. Before, therefore, a Mosaick statute can be acknowledged to possess a binding authority over me, or the community of which I am a member, I must ascertain its *reason*, its principle. If, on a fair and candid examination, I discover that the *reason fully holds*, the statute I pronounce to be binding. If there be a difference of circumstances, not, however, destructive of the general reason, I am bound to *modify* so as to suit the peculiarity. If the circumstances be so different that the reason ceases altogether, *it is abrogated.*' Pages 6, 7, 8. Again. The 18th chapter of Leviticus he virtually admits contains no precepts of moral obligation, for he says it 'stands in the midst of a cluster of precepts, which are acknowledged to be long since done away. Look at the chapter immediately preceding, and you find it *full* of ceremonial and judicial peculiarities. There is not one precept of moral obligation in it, from beginning to end.' Page 9. Having adduced proof of this assertion, he adds, 'These are exploded; and must we be put off with a *sic volo, sic jubeo*, when we ask why a greater importance and permanence are attributed to the prohibition of marriages? No institution has been more modified by custom, and peculiarity of national manners; nay, in the Hebrew law itself, I could point out numberless singularities of this rite, which no one will contend societies in our day are bound to imitate. We are, therefore, totally in the dark until the question be fully decided—what means the law of incest in general? Having obtained the *reason*, we can soon, and easily judge, whether, and how far, the Levitical precepts carry with them the force of obligation. We can judge, also, whether the circumstances of modern society so far differ from those of the Hebrew nation as to require a *revision and extension* of that code—in a word, we shall be able, unless I am greatly mistaken, to fix the true character of the marriage more immediately under consideration.' Page 10.

"Such, then, is his argument, stated fairly in his own words. The connexion in marriage of a man with his wife's sister is not sanctioned by GENERAL EXPEDIENCY. The Levitical law, on which some place so much reliance to prove the unlawfulness of the connexion, is confessedly *not of moral obligation*, but depends, as to the extent of its application, *on circumstances*. Circumstances are variable things. The manners, habits, and feelings of a people may change, and then the application of the law may be modified, or suspended altogether, according to circumstances. And Reason, which he says very justly is 'a most excellent assistant in her place,' is to fix authoritatively the extent of this application. 'Let it not be said, that this is putting too much confidence in the fallible judgment of men. It is very foolish to argue against a *fact*, and the plain fact is, that we are necessitated to this course.' Page 8. No—Reason, which a few years ago performed such wonders in revolutionary France, and which many men, great in the estimation of the world, in every age, have worshipped with more sincere and entire devotednes than the Ephesians did their great goddess Diana—REASON is to be both *guide and judge* in this matter, when the Bible, the only infallible rule of faith and practice, is laid aside. And, indeed, it must be so—there is no avoiding it. It may be well to represent her only as an *assistant*, lest her investiture with infallibility should excite unnecessary alarm; but, the truth is, she must strike out the path, and *determine the boundaries* where criminality ends and innocence begins, in matrimonial connexions. By the way, it appears to me very fortunate for the friends, as they are termed, of this particular connexion, that two men who are so decidedly opposed to it should take ground so dissimilar and opposite; that the one, and the very Hercules in the controversy, should turn round, and look-

ing the other full in the face, say, with a contemptuous sneer, your Scripture arguments are all chaff! We are the judges ourselves of what is lawful and unlawful. Circumstances alter cases; the circumstances of a people change, and the law of marriage must be altered and adapted to the existing circumstances. Nay, I will go a little further. If the civil law does not regulate the matter, as the habits and feelings of one family, or of one individual, differ from those of another, what might be proper in one case would be exceedingly improper in another. Or, to be plain, 'consanguinity has nothing more to do with incest in itself than having the same length of nose, or wearing the same coloured stockings. It is not the consanguinity, but its *effects*—the opportunities and temptations which flow from it, that the legislator has exclusively in his eye.' And 'I now venture to observe, that a perfectly satisfactory rule is furnished us, by which, in the honest exercise of our understandings, and untrammelled by a slavish attachment to the *letter* of the Levitical law, we may determine how far the Code of Incest is to be extended in the time and circumstances in which we live. The rule is this: The law being intended to guard against the dangers threatening domestick purity from constant, unrestricted intercourse; wherever *such intercourse* may, in consequence of the habits and manners of a people, be presumed to exist,—THERE, no matter what be, or be not, the degrees of consanguinity and affinity, the *law should take effect;*—marriage be prohibited.' Page 20. 'We pay quite an undue degree of honour to the circumstance of actual relationship and its grades, when we judge the law of Incest by it exclusively,—in the esteem of enlightened legislators, the INTERCOURSE, which from the custom and manners of a country may be presumed to exist, is a consideration vastly more important,—and—the only question to be asked on the subject more immediately before us, is the very plain and intelligible one: *Whether the probabilities of close and intimate familiarity between brother-in-law and sister-in-law be such as to demand the interposition of this great moral preservative?*' —In certain circumstances, that is, if the fact of constant intercourse exists, it would be unlawful for you to marry your sewing girl, or indeed any female friend, however distantly related, whether by the ties of nature or friendship. On the other hand, if my employment and lot in providence be such, that I scarcely see my sister-in-law till after my wife's death, I may lawfully marry her. In the one case, it would not be suitable to circumstances, but in the other, it would be perfectly so. EXPEDIENCY, therefore, must decide the question with individuals, families, and nations. Now, Sir, all this is plausible: it is very good. *Expediency* is a pliable argument;—like a nose of wax, it may be made short or long, sharp or blunt, crooked or straight, just as you please."

We have given this long extract, because it exhibits at once the leading opinions and arguments both of Domesticus and Clericus. We shall now offer a few short remarks of our own.

Much is said in this controversy against inferential reasoning. But this is a kind of reasoning, distinctly recognised as legitimate, in the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian church (chap. 1. sect. vi.); and it is in fact on this reasoning alone that we must rest, and may safely rest, some of the most important institutions of our holy religion, particularly infant baptism and the Christian Sabbath. It is, also, only by this kind of reasoning that we are authorized to charge guilt upon the female sex—in more than one instance of all the incestuous marriages prohibited in the eighteenth chapter of Leviticus. The prohibitions are immediately addressed to the male sex, and if direct prohibition is necessary to constitute guilt, women may be guiltless when the grossest incest is committed. We are confident that the more this subject is examined, the more clearly it will appear, that what "may be deduced by good and necessary consequence from scripture," is as valid as that which is expressly set down in the sacred volume. All must have recourse to this kind of arguing, who deny that polygamy is the object of prohibition in Lev. xviii. 18, or else concede that it is not forbidden in the whole Bible. It is by inference only, that they can find polygamy prohibited by our Saviour and the Apostle Paul. Within our memory, a work of far more learning and plausibility than Domesticus has yet given us, was published by a clergyman in England, the Rev. Mr. Madan, to show that polygamy is no where condemn-

ed or forbidden in scripture; but that it is the great preservative from impurity, like D.'s law of incest; and ought therefore to be encouraged in all communities. From the circumstance that the apostle forbids it to clergymen, it was urged that it was doubtless lawful to all other men; exactly as it is now reasoned, that as Moses forbids a man to take a wife to her sister to vex her in her life time, it necessarily follows that he may take the second after the death of the first. No small portion of the talent of Britain was employed to confute this work of the Rev. Mr. Madan. See the 63d vol. of the Monthly Review. We have personally known a Presbyterian elder, and a shrewd one too, who earnestly maintained that polygamy was perfectly agreeable to the law of God, and forbidden only by the laws of the state. It is a little remarkable that our opponents apply inferential reasoning, not only to the words of Christ and the apostle, but to Lev. xviii. 18, and yet deny its applicability to the rest of that chapter. While Moses moreover gives it as a reason why a man should not marry two sisters at once, that the second would *vex* the first, our modern logicians contend that it will *comfort* a woman exceedingly, to know that her sister is to take her place after her death; and that this second wife will be the kindest mother in the world to the children of the first. We maintain that all experience, as well as the word of God, is against this theory.

We scarcely know of a commentator on the law of incest, as contained in the chapter so frequently referred to, who does not remark, that one of the salutary effects of prohibiting marriages among those who are nearly related by consanguinity and affinity, is, that the temptation to uncleanness is thereby prevented, among those of the opposite sexes who usually have the most frequent intercourse with each other. The remark is unquestionably just; but when Domesticus seizes on this *circumstance*, and endeavours to derive from it the very *principle* and whole *sanction* of the law, it leads him to the most extravagant and shocking absurdities—to deny that there is any natural abhorrence of incest—that but for the consideration which he states, the nearest of all relatives, even by consanguinity, might intermarry:—And on the contrary, to maintain that the law of incest extends, or ought to extend, to all possible cases, in which frequent intercourse between the sexes takes place. On this last principle he is obliged to admit, that it would scarcely be possible to specify all the cases to which the law ought to extend. A wide door, it is clear, would be open, for dispute whether, in many a particular case, the law had been violated or not; whether the parties had been previously so much in each other's company, as to render it lawful, or unlawful, to marry. We lately read of a man who courted a woman assiduously for more than thirty years, and afterwards married her. Now, by the rule of Domesticus, he ought *never* to have married her; and surely it is but reasonable that Domesticus should tell us how long, upon his principle, a man may court a woman, before it becomes unlawful for him to marry her. Domesticus also extends the influence of the principle he adopts, beyond all the bounds of truth and experience; and even to the superseding, as his answerers have remarked, of the necessity of the seventh commandment—so far as it relates to those of the different sexes who have habitual intercourse with each other.

According to Domesticus, the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian church, in the article submitted to the presbyteries, is right entirely *by accident*. It so *happens*, that those who are nearly related to each other by consanguinity or affinity have, in our country, and in many other countries, familiar intercourse with each other, and therefore they ought not to intermarry; but if it had *happened* otherwise—if it had happened that

daughters, as soon as born, were separated from their fathers, and sisters from their brothers, these relatives might intermarry without fault. Let no reader start at this consequence; for Domesticus himself looks it right in the face, without blushing. He is even content that the whole doctrine of his essay should stand or fall with it. On this point Veritas justly remarks as follows—

"I fear that Domesticus, notwithstanding the very vivid picture he gives of domestick purity, has unwittingly given countenance to a most dangerous licentiousness, by declaring his belief, 'that there is no natural *impropriety* in the nearest relations having sexual communion.' And by saying again, 'not that consanguinity has any thing more to do with incest, in itself, than having the same length of nose, or wearing the same coloured stockings.' It is seriously to be regretted that he did not comply with the judicious advice of his friends in suppressing these sentiments. In doing so, he would have found an appropriate place for his principle of expediency. Their publication may do more injury to the cause of morality, than his mysterious guardian may be able to counteract. Such opinions, emanating from such a source, may not only obtain access to the minds of the *vulgar*, many of whom may be able, from natural good sense, or experimental piety, to resist their deleterious influence, but become incorporated into the practical morality of many of our educated youth, who will naturally slide into the system of infidelity, with which these opinions have heretofore been associated. It is a pity they had not been left there. They sound too much like the licentious philosophy of the Voltairean school, to be ingrafted into the system of Christian morals."

Domesticus supposes that his favourite principle will always, and safely, lead to the conclusion which he adopts. But we could not help remarking, that the infidel Hume, taking reason and philosophy for his guide, arrived at exactly the opposite conclusion, in the case of Henry the Eighth of England. Yes—and set aside the scriptural rule, and subject the whole law to the supposed dictates of reason and expediency, and every man who wishes to marry his wife's sister, or his brother's wife, will arrive at the same conclusion—We do not say fairly, but yet really, plausibly, and to himself satisfactorily. The plain truth is, that Domesticus, in this whole argument, is on infidel ground. He deserts the word of God, and goes to reason and expediency for his law; and here, such men as Hume will stand a good chance to beat him at his own weapons.

Clericus justly remarks, on the argument of Domesticus, as founded on expediency, that "notwithstanding all his zeal for this great but very flexible principle, he seems afterwards conscience struck that it will not bear him out, in defending the usual practice of the church." After reading in his pamphlet, the reasoning and ridicule which he employs to show that the Levitical law of incest has, and can have, no binding force on Christian people, because it stands in a cluster of ceremonial enactments, and is itself such an enactment, obligatory only on ancient Israel—what was our surprise to find in a note, in the last page but one of his pamphlet, the following statement—

"The reader will please to accept my whole doctrine in four propositions. 1st. The Levitical law of incest, the *whole law*, is binding on Christian societies. It carries on its front, the stamp of permanent obligation,—being adapted to guard against a danger common to us with the ancient Hebrews, and which can be guarded against only by respecting its provisions.

"2dly. The same reason demands that something more than the *letter* of that law be regarded,—that whatever is deducible from it, by construction (not the mechanical balancing, to which I have repeatedly alluded, but fair interpretation in conformity with the general principle of incest) is as really part of the Divine will, as if an angel pronounced it to us by an audible voice.

"3dly. It is the duty of the civil magistrate, carefully and with a deep feeling of responsibility, to make these deductions,—to give them all the authority of law and support them by the most weighty sanctions.

"4thly. If the civil magistrate neglects his duty, the church of Jesus Christ must rebuke his unfaithfulness and take care not to become partaker in his sin. We

be to her,—if she allows vice and misery to prevail in any of their forms, without using her influence and authority against them. A double wo,—if she takes the lead in surrendering to the enemy. In regard to the particular subject under discussion, the magistrate has performed his duty nobly. It is not a little singular that the church should have exhibited the *first* symptoms of degeneracy."

Only strike out the parenthesis from the second proposition in this quotation, or consider it as it seems to be intended—as a *saving clause*, to preserve some show of consistency in the author—and we have not one word to object against this statement of "the whole doctrine" of Domesticus. We can subscribe it cheerfully and cordially. It stands on the very ground for which we contend, and goes to the utmost extent of our wishes; and we could freely forgive the writer for all the extravagance and flippancy which precedes it in his pamphlet, if we could only be sure that all his readers would consider him as here *unsaying* the most of what he has said before. With this remark we leave him.

We have already expressed our opinion of the work of Dr. Livingston—have given some extracts from it, and sincerely regret that we have not room for more. It is in our judgment, *instar omnium*, in relation to this subject. In a few unessential particulars we must differ from him; but we differ with all the diffidence of an affectionate scholar, who cannot fully agree with an able master. Although it is not usual to review a work which has been ten years published, we determined to bring this distinctly before our readers; not solely because we intended to quote it, but for the purpose of recommending it, as we now earnestly do, to the careful perusal of all who can obtain a copy.

The pamphlet of Mr. M'Iver contains a historical statement of the case of M'Crimmon—the case which has occasioned a reference to the Presbyteries, and given rise to this whole controversy. The narrative part of the pamphlet is perspicuous, full and satisfactory; and the speech which he delivered before the Assembly does him credit in every view of it—It appears that M'Crimmon has entirely forsaken the Presbyterian church, and gone to the Baptists. We hope that our Baptist brethren, for whom we cherish a sincere affection, will not, for their own sakes, receive such men to their fellowship and communion—We say for their own sakes, because we certainly esteem it no loss to the Presbyterian church when any man of this description leaves it, and no gain to any church that receives him.

In drawing our review to a close, we wish our readers to know, that we are fully aware it may be remarked, perhaps with some satisfaction by our opponents, that in the interpretation we have given to the eighteenth chapter of Leviticus, our appeal has been to the opinion of commentators, controvertists, and councils, and not to any new and convincing arguments of our own. But we have done this under a deliberate conviction, that in no other way could any thing be said that ought to have, and that would have, nearly as much weight, with the whole discerning and considerate part of the community. We do not believe that the study of a month, or a twelvemonth, would enable any man in the United States, to offer a new thought or argument, of any worth, on the one side or the other of this controversy—we mean as it arises out of the interpretation of the chapter referred to—Nay, we do not believe that a new thought has been offered on it, for nearly two hundred years past. All that can be said has been said, and repeated a hundred times, for centuries that have gone by.* Now,

* Whoever is able and willing to read, on this subject, nearly two folio volumes in Latin, plentifully interspersed with quotations of Hebrew (both biblical and rabbinical), Greek, Syriac, Arabic and Persic, ought carefully to consult the fol-

in such a case, the best appeal that can be made, is to the deliberate opinion of the Christian publick, in regard to arguments and considerations that have been so long in view. The general and practical conviction of enlightened individuals and communities, affords, in every such case, the best evidence, to show on which side of a controverted point the truth lies—They are the jury, who decide the cause after the pleadings are finished. We have therefore shown that all Christendom, from the earliest periods of the Christian church to the present hour, after the most learned and thorough investigation of this subject, has steadfastly abided in practice, by that construction of the eighteenth chapter of Leviticus for which we are advocates—The only appearance of an exception is in our own country; and this we solemnly believe is not owing to new light, and an impartial view of the subject, but to the relaxation of church discipline; and to the repeal in one or two instances, and the non-execution generally, of the civil enactments which prohibit and punish incest.

And we now most seriously entreat those of our readers who, as ministers and elders of the Presbyterian church, will shortly be called to vote on the retention or rejection of that part of the article in our Confession of Faith which relates to this subject, to consider well what they do. What, we ask, will they gain by a rejection or repeal of the article? Will they produce uniformity of practice, and thus prevent controversy and appeals, which seems to be the principal object in view—No such thing. There will be as much controversy and as many appeals afterwards, as in times past. Nay, there are portions of the Presbyterian church that cannot, and will not, yield to any *human authority*, which sanctions the marriages in question. They dare not do it—They would sooner suffer the severest censures of the church, leave it, or be expelled from it, than submit, even silently, to what they consider as an abomination in the sight of God, and forbidden by his holy law. And for the sake of relieving a few individuals, who, it is agreed on all hands, have acted indiscreetly, and violated the law of Christian charity, shall the inoffensive and conscientious be grieved? Shall they be driven from our communion? Shall the Presbyterian church be the first on earth, *formally* to open a door, as many other churches will account it, for the most detestable licentiousness and impurity? Is this church willing to present herself to the world, as leading the way, to what the most of Christendom will consider, and we think justly consider, as land defiling, and heaven provoking iniquity? Forbid it reputation, justice, decency, humanity, conscience and piety—Great Head of the church, forbid it!

lowing works of the immortal SELDEN; De Jure Naturali et Gentuim, juxta disciplinam Ebræorum—Uxor Ebraica—De Synedriis Veterum Ebræorum. We certainly make no pretence to much acquaintance with these works; but since we began to write this review, we have looked into them till we were heartily tired; and believe that whoever should go through, and comprehend them, would have little more to learn on this subject.

Literary and Philosophical Intelligence, etc.

Auriscope.—The difficulty of inspecting the Meatus Auditorius, or Passage of the Ear, from its peculiar winding structure, is well known; hence the uncertainty that often arises in ascertaining the cause of diseases in this organ. In consequence of a greater attention being paid to diseases of the ear than formerly, an ingenious French Aurist has lately invented a novel instrument, termed an Auriscope, which allows a complete inspection of the parts. It consists of a circular brass plate

with straps that go completely round the head, and at the angle over each ear is affixed a hook and screw, together with a lever, so as to pull the ear backwards and forwards in different directions, and thus lay the meatus open to the membrane of the tympanum. But this instrument being complex in its mechanism, and painful in its application, has been reduced to greater simplicity and effect by Mr. J. Harrison Curtis, the Surgeon to the London Royal Dispensary for Diseases of the Ear, where, since making these alterations, he has had ample opportunities of appreciating its merits.

A gentleman who has discovered a mode of dressing flax without rotting, and who has an establishment in successful operation on the Hudson river, has agreed, if the produce of two hundred acres of flax land can be secured to him, to locate himself in Essex or Middlesex county, where he will give fifteen dollars per ton for flax from the field, after the seed is taken off, without any other preparation. It is calculated that at this price a net profit of from twelve to eighteen dollars per acre, may be realized from the land; while the farmers will be freed from the trouble of rotting, dressing, &c., and yet the gentleman proposes to sell his dressed flax cheaper by 20 per cent., than others who first rot, and then dress it. Besides, the flax that is dressed without rotting, is much stronger, loses less in the manufacture, is firmer, and more soft.

The Rev. W. Evans, of Llandefeilog, Carmarthenshire, Wales, has announced the following discovery for maintaining and keeping horses without the aid of hay and corn, viz:—"Cut straw and potatoes, or straw, chaff, and pounded furze mixed, wetted with some salted water, prepared as follows: let a tub of fresh water, with an egg in it, be impregnated with as much domestick salt as will cause the egg to rise and float on the surface, that being the criterion of its saltness equal to that of sea-water. The provender being put into a wicker basket, and placed on the tub, pour the salted water upon it, in quantity sufficient to wet the whole mess —and when it shall have done filtering through it, give it to the horses. The salted water will not only moisten and sweeten the food, but also operate as a most efficient alterative, to purify the blood, purge all gross humours, prevent the increase of worms, and all painful attacks from those troublesome vermin. Horses fed in this manner will work well, and will be fit for all sorts of work; and if this method be but tried, it will not fail of recommending itself for general adoption. My man cuts with one knife-machine, in four hours, enough wheaten straw for nine horses for twenty-four hours."

Winter Food for Cows.—M. Chabert, the director of the Veterinary school at Alfort, had a number of cows which yielded twelve gallons of milk every day. In his publication on the subject, he observes, that cows fed in the winter upon dry substances, give less milk than those which are kept upon a green diet, and also that their milk loses much of its quality. He published the following recipe, by the use of which his cows afforded an equal quantity and quality of milk during the winter as during the summer:—"Take a bushel of potatoes, break them whilst raw, place them in a barrel standing up, putting in successively a layer of potatoes and a layer of bran, and a small quantity of yeast in the middle of the mass, which is thus left to ferment during a whole week, and when the vinous taste has pervaded the whole mixture, it is given to the cows, who eat it greedily."

Ancient Vases.—The proprietor of an estate in Tuscany having employed some workmen to make excavations, had the good fortune to discover an extensive Etruscan sepulchre, in which there were about 800 vases, equally remarkable for beauty of form and elegant design. He has presented the whole to the Grand Duke of Tuscany, who has ordered them to be placed in the Museum of Florence.

Bell's Weekly Messenger gives the following account of the rise of the National Debt of England.

At the Revolution, in 1689,	£1,054,925
At the peace of Ryswick, 1697,	21,515,742
At the peace of Utrecht, 1714,	53,681,076
At the peace of Aix la Chapelle, 1758,	78,293,313
At the peace of Paris, 1763,	183,259,275
At the peace of Versailles, after the American war, 1783,	238,232,243
At the peace of Amiens, 1802,	499,752,073
Amount of the debt in 1813,	600,000,000
Estimated amount, on the 5th of Jan. 1827	900,000,000

A Milledgeville (Geo.) paper notices the formation of two large vineyards in the neighbourhood of that place. The climate of Georgia is every way suitable to the cultivation of the grape, and the experiment has been successfully tried. The continued depreciation of cotton renders it more than ever necessary to seek for some staple, which will reward the toil, and return an interest on the capital of the planter.

Ancient Roman Foot.—From the inquiries of M. Cagnazzi, to whom the scientifick examination of the monuments of antiquity found in Herculaneum and Pompeii was intrusted by the Neapolitan government, it appears that the ancient Roman foot was 0.29624 of a metre, or 101.325 lines French measure.

Religious Intelligence.

Within the last month we have received from a much esteemed correspondent, a letter, from which we give the following extract—containing information that will be highly interesting to the friends of vital piety, and the general diffusion of the Holy Scriptures.

—

"You have been long aware of the tottering state of the Bible Society in Russia, and will not be surprised that it has now fallen. Its officers have been dismissed, and its operations ceased; but there is a stock of about 200,000 copies of the Scriptures, in different languages, in its stores; and, in whatever way they may be hereafter circulated, this incorruptible seed will not be in vain.

"Let me state to you at the same time, a fact, connected with the operations of the Russian Bible Society, while it has had existence, in which you will greatly rejoice. The consequence of an extensive circulation of the word of God in that vast empire, for many years past has been, to raise up in various parts of it, and to a very great extent, a body of 'Scriptural or Bible Christians' who have renounced the Greek Church, and under this denomination associate together, to read and study the Holy Scriptures, acknowledging this blessed Book as the only rule of faith and practice, and observing the Christian Sabbath as a day of sacred rest. A considerable effect, I understand, is manifest in the peaceable and orderly lives of the people who are thus separating under the influence of Christian truth; and some circumstances have been related which afford a pleasing evidence of truly Christian principles operating on their minds. Thus, my dear friend, is the most high God ruling and overruling amongst the children of men, to carry on his purposes of mercy in his own way; cheering us by rays of light in the darkest seasons, and saying to us, 'be still, and know that I am God.' Let us continue waiting on him, still sowing in hope as opportunities arise, and where his providence directs, assured that it shall not be altogether in vain, however feeble and inefficient the instrument employed may be.

"A few months since I mentioned to our friend ——— a movement amongst the Jews in Constantinople, and that a number had received Christ as the Messiah, of which a son of a Chief Rabbi was one. They were looking forward to suffering, but most of all feared a very rich and powerful Jew, who, from the situation he held under the Turkish government, was known by the name of the Sapdgi, his influence being such, that he could effect the ruin of any individual disposed to Christianity: this rendered them cautious in their meeting together, to avoid suspicion.—It so happened, however, that in the course of events, connected with the revolt of the Janissaries, this man, who stood so high in favour, fell under the Sultan's displeasure.—He ordered him to be beheaded, and seized all his treasure;—thus, the enemy who was most feared was removed out of the way. By the last accounts, however, it appears that a persecution has now commenced: one of the Jews who has embraced Christianity, has been committed to prison, and severely bastinadoed; after which, his immediate release was promised if he would renounce Christ, or, if he would not, a repetition of punishment was threatened; but he continues faithful, and a confidence is felt that others are also ready to go to prison and to death for the name of Christ.

"The effect of the free circulation of the Scriptures amongst the Catholics, is beginning to appear in the south of France: in Lyons and the neighbourhood, no less than 1500 Roman Catholics have embraced Protestantism. In some parts of Germany, particularly Wirtemberg, the people meet together in the villages to read the Scriptures. In Prussia a good work is said to be going on amongst all ranks; and also in the Canton de Vaud, in Switzerland, where many are brought under the power of the truth.

"I am glad to observe Mr. Sergeant's appointment to the Congress of South America, hoping much good will result to the new States, from the association of their Representatives with men of liberal and enlightened Christian views. Mr. Thomson will probably go to Mexico in the course of a few weeks, as agent to the British and Foreign Bible Society. I shall give him an introduction to Mr. S., anticipating it as probable that he may attend the meeting adjourned there from Panama.

"In a late New York Observer, I was pleased with a statement, that in some of the old slave-holding states, Maryland particularly, the landholders are beginning to find that their interest is promoted by the employment of free labour in preference to slaves. Should this powerful principle in the human heart be brought into full operation on the subject, it may tend rapidly to effect the desirable end; showing at the same time, that selfish views and feelings are equally unfavourable to the real interest of man in the present state, as they are inconsistent with his future good as a moral and unaccountable being."

FOR THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

OBITUARY NOTICE OF GENERAL JOHN STEELE, *late Collector of the Port of Philadelphia, and of* ABIGAIL, *his Wife; the first of whom departed this Life on the 27th of February, and the latter on the 13th of March*, 1827.

This venerable couple, when released from earth, had been united to each other in the happiest matrimonial union during the lapse of forty-three years, lacking only three days; and by death were not long divided. They were born within a few months of each other, in the county of Lancaster, in Pennsylvania, of respectable families of Presbyterians—were brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord—became pious in early life, and together lived in the service of their Lord and Master, Jesus Christ, until they had nearly completed their three score years and ten. Their attachment to each other was formed a short time before the commencement of the war of our American revolution, and their intended nuptials were delayed for seven years, by patriotic devotion to the cause of liberty and our country. During the contest for national independence, General Steele, then a youth, full of ardour and enterprise, followed the immortal Washington through all his toils and privations. He was actively engaged in the battle of Brandywine, in which he received a British ball through his shoulder; but for this affliction he felt himself compensated by participation in the capture of Lord Cornwallis. His pious parents had cherished the hope in his youth, that he would become a minister of the gospel, and with a view to this sacred office, he was under the tuition of the Rev. James Latta, D.D., at Chesnut Level, when he heard the call of his country to arms, and declared to his venerable preceptor, that until his country was free, he must relinquish his studies for the camp. He entered the army as a volunteer, and though young, soon obtained the command of a veteran company. From loss of blood by the wound which he received, he was reduced so low as scarcely to breathe; and was sometimes thought to be dead; but six faithful soldiers carried him away several miles on a sheet, (his weakness preventing any other mode of removal,) and quartered him for a season in the family of two ancient maiden ladies, who though entirely strangers to him, nursed him assiduously, and under Providence were the means of his restoration. His sense of obligation to them, and his gratitude, were lasting as life.

Before he could return to active military duty, his father heard what had befallen his son, and after much search, found him in Bucks county, whither he had been carried, after many removals, with a view to his safety. His temporary residence at home, while disabled, was nearly as dangerous as the battle of the Brandywine; for an unskilful surgeon, thinking it necessary to probe his wound, divided a large artery, and had not the means of tying it. To prevent him from bleeding to death, his sister held the orifice with her fingers, while a messenger was despatched to procure another physician from Lancaster. He came, but alas! without his case of instruments, and was obliged to return for them; so that a distance of sixteen miles was travelled over four times, while a sister's hand alone performed the office of a ligature.

Returning health and strength restored the young soldier to his companions in arms, not at all discouraged by what he had suffered.

At the close of the war, poor and penyless, he returned to his native abode, with the consciousness of having served his country faithfully, which was then the only pay of our disbanded revolutionary worthies. He arrived at the end of a lane which led from the main road to his paternal mansion, cheered with the expectation of embracing, after years of absence and toil, his much loved relatives: but here a new conflict awaited him, for he saw collected under the shady trees which surrounded his home a multitude of horses, carriages and people, evidently about to move in funereal procession; and he could not advance. "Who now is dead?" said he to himself; "Is it my father? Is it my mother? Or is it some other member of my family?" Proposing such questions to himself, he lingered at the end of the avenue; desiring, and yet dreading to know the truth; until he finally beckoned a passenger to him, and learned,

that he had arrived just in time to inter HIS FATHER.

To the honour of Mrs. Steele it may be stated, that she preferred the young soldier, wounded as he was, and then destitute of worldly substance, to an affluent and worthy young gentleman who long sought her hand; and she firmly declared to her parents, who favoured the pretensions of the latter, that if they would not consent to her union with Captain Steele, she would never be married to any one. Another incident will illustrate her character. Before marriage she lived with her brother, who was a printer in Lancaster, and while keeping his house, often employed her needle in his office. Having watched him in setting up types, she said, one day, "Brother, I think I can help you;" and at once commenced her operations, and actually set up the first *Pocket Almanack* which was ever printed in this commonwealth. With firmness, decision, enterprise, and activity, she united all the more amiable attributes of an accomplished lady. She was, as will naturally be concluded from the two incidents just named, admirably suited for the connexion in life which was formed with General Steele, soon after the termination of the war: and it was, perhaps, as much owing to her knowledge of the business of a printer as to the versatility of the genius of her husband, that they came to Philadelphia, and engaged in that professional business which Franklin immortalized, and which has immortalized Franklin.

Setting us a praiseworthy example of industry and of independence of character; of independence of every thing but the gracious God and the resources of our own minds; when the arts were comparatively new in our country—General Steele, with his own hands, cast the type with which he and his youthful partner set up the first American edition of Dilworth's Spelling Book, and a copy of the New Testament. Stereotype plates had not then come into use; but the types for these two works were fast locked in chases, and the original proprietor of them published edition after edition, for the instruction and edification of multitudes of schools, and hundreds of thousands of his fellow-citizens.

Subsequently General Steele removed to a paper manufactory, which he established on the Octorara, and there also he multiplied copies from his standing types, and occasionally repaired them by casting the defaced letters anew. These leaden pages were finally brought back to this city; and some of them, it is believed, are still, or were lately, in possession of Mathew Carey, Esq., one of our most enterprising booksellers, who having himself procured a better set of standing forms, purchased the old ones to stop the circulation of a work inferior to his own.

Agriculture was the favourite pursuit, however, of General Steele, and from his paper manufactory and printing he retired to his farm. While cultivating his native fields he frequently represented his district in the House of Representatives and in the Senate of Pennsylvania; and was very useful in settling the difficulties between the different claimants of land in Luzerne county, which were long a source of agitation and anxiety to the community.

In 1808 he was appointed collector of the revenue of the United States for the port of Philadelphia, and filled this important office with exemplary ability and fidelity, until in view of approaching death, he resigned it at the close of the year 1826. It was deemed a thing incredible, when he first entered into this trust, that any farmer, not bred to merchandise, could manage so complicated and extensive an establishment as that of the custom-house in this city; but no one has ever collected the revenue more entirely to the satisfaction of all concerned. In the school of Washington he had been trained to system and punctuality; and such was his determined integrity of character, that he never suffered one dollar of the monies of the United States to come into his own hands: all was paid into Bank, whence he drew nothing but his salary, after it had become due. The only fault with which I have ever known any to charge him was this, that he could not give offices under him to all needy applicants.

To his latest breath the devotion of General Steele to his country was intelligent and ardent. He was a zealous advocate for our representative system of government, for domestick manufactures, for internal improvements, and for agricultural pursuits. He wished to see his country as independent as possible of every other country for all the means of life, the productions of the useful arts, and the blessings of science and religion: and his greatest fear for the United States was, that our national and individual ingratitude to God, pride, and extravagance, especially in pecuniary speculation, would at some future time procure heavy judgments, if not the subversion of our great republick. He was indeed a politician, but not one anxious to aggrandize himself; and a patriot; but not one that could ascribe all our national prosperity to human agency, irrespective of the Divine government.

Of General Steele's domestick character, and as the highest evidence of the

prudence, self-government and equanimity of himself and his partner, let it be recorded, that during their whole union of nearly forty-three years, *they never exchanged one harsh or unkind word.* This was their own testimony concerning each other, which might be corroborated by all who were at any time intimate in their family. Out of a million of truly happy marriages, it might be difficult to find another couple, concerning whom we could safely make such an unqualified assertion as this.

It remains for me to write a few things concerning the religious character of these lately deceased companions. They were Christians indeed, without lukewarmness, bigotry, or guile. At an early period of life they professed their faith in the Gospel, and subjection in heart and life to the blessed Saviour. Their whole conduct corresponded with their religious profession, and evinced it to be sincere. They were lovers of the Sabbath, of the house of worship, of the Christian sacraments, of the doctrines of grace as taught in the Presbyterian confession of faith, of civil and religious liberty, of all good men, and of the Lord our God. Of the Presbyterian church at Chesnut Level, General Steele was a ruling elder; and he often officiated in that character in the Third Presbyterian church in this city, of which he was a trustee, and one of its most valuable members. As he and his partner drew nearer and nearer the eternal world, by the gradual encroachments of the consumption of the lungs, their Christian graces became more bright and glorious. Each of them manifested a cheerful resignation to the will of God, and while desirous of dying, that they might be with Jesus and be like him, they patiently waited until their time came. Death and the future life, instead of being frightful things, of which some dying persons are unwilling that even a minister of the Gospel should speak to them, were the theme of their calm meditation, conversation, faith, and prayer. Mrs. Steele continued to sit up more or less until she saw her husband quietly resign his breath into the hands of his Redeemer, without a struggle or a groan: she then retired to her bed, and nature sunk apace. On the morning after his decease I expected to find her gloomy and depressed in her feelings; but it was far otherwise, and she said to me with great animation, "I have been reflecting with thankfulness that my dear husband has now spent one night with his blessed Saviour." In this frame of mind she continued until her transit to the skies. Just before her decease, her son-in-law, the Rev. Dr. Philip Milledoler, at her request, united with her and the family in prayer, and before her watching friends were aware of it, her spirit had fled to mansions of everlasting blessedness. Happy couple! Blessed in life, and thrice blessed in death!

May our last end be like theirs; for they sleep in Jesus. E. S. E.

Philadelphia, March 27, 1827.

The Treasurer of the Trustees of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church acknowledges the receipt of the following sums for their Theological Seminary at Princeton, (N. J.) during the month of March last, viz.

Of Robert M'Mullin, Esq., in full of his subscription for the Permanent Fund		$50 00
Of Rev. Dr. Samuel Miller, a contribution from a member of the First Class of 1824, toward founding the Professorship of Oriental and Biblical Literature		30 00
Of Rev. Edward N. Kirk, a member of the First Class of 1825, for "the instruction of some indigent student, who shall consider it as a loan to be repaid when Providence makes it practicable." In part of his subscription	$25	
And one year's interest due last September,	6	31 00
Total		$111 00

View of Publick Affairs.

EUROPE.

Nothing of great importance has reached us from Europe within the month past.

BRITAIN.—The latest advices which we have seen from Britain are from Liverpool of the 21st of Feb. Parliament assembled after the holidays on the 8th of that month. A letter from that place states that Lord Liverpool had been dangerously ill of a disease characteristick of apoplexy, and that Mr. Canning continued in an ill state of health. Great publick anxiety was manifested in regard to the illness of Lord Liver-

pool. Stocks, in consequence, had fallen two per cent. The writer adds—"What effect this may have in postponing the subject of the corn laws, or in producing a change in the ministry, cannot yet be determined." The corn laws, Catholick emancipation, a change of ministry, the splendid funeral of the Duke of York, and the appointment of the Duke of Wellington in his place as commander-in-chief of the armies—these are the topicks of domestick news, on which the London papers received through the month chiefly dwell. The Duke of Clarence, on a message from the king, had received an additional allowance of £3000 sterling per annum, and his duchess £6000. Their whole allowance is £38,500 per annum. It appears that disease had invaded many of the distinguished personages of Britain. Besides Lord Liverpool and Mr. Canning, the royal Dukes of Cumberland and Sussex, and Mr. Huskinson of the House of Commons, had been seriously ill; and the king himself was at Brighton, confined with the gout—Nothing of great publick interest had taken place in Parliament. The commercial distress of the kingdom was abated. A parliamentary account states, that the annual income is about 55 million sterling, and the expenditure 54 million, leaving one million for the sinking fund. An expedition to the north pole was fitting out under Captain Parry.

France.—Great excitement has been produced in the French chambers by the project of a law on the press, which it was affirmed by the opposers of the law was destructive of the interests and dignity of literature. The French Academy took up the subject, and presented a supplicatory remonstrance to the king. It had been assailed with great vehemence in the chamber of deputies, and it was believed that in despite of court influence, the law would not be passed. The French finances were in a very prosperous state, the revenue exceeding the expenditure by a considerable surplus.

Spain.—It appears that the court of Spain have been sadly disappointed in an expectation that Russia would bear them out in countenancing the Portuguese rebels. The emperor Nicholas has explicitly declared, that Spain will receive no aid or countenance from him, in any interference with Portugal. This we believe has determined the Spanish court to change its views and its measures—not its wishes. There will probably be a little more done to save appearances, and then all the bustle about Portugal will be over.

Portugal.—The civil war in Portugal is apparently all but terminated. The rebels, after some hard fighting, have been defeated and dispersed. We cannot find that the British troops have been employed in active service at all. They remain, however, in Portugal. The Chamber of Deputies was in session, Jan. 20, and a project of a law was presented for declaring the ports of Lisbon open to all nations, with a duty of one per cent. on the re-exportation of goods—This law was likely to pass.

Russia.—As was to be expected, the Russians appear to have vanquished the Persian troops, and to have made a considerable inroad into that empire.—No details however are given in the last accounts.

Greece.—The cause of Greece continues to wear a cheering aspect. The siege of Athens has been raised; and the Turkish forces have been so much worsted in a number of engagements, that throughout the whole of Peninsular Greece, they appear to hold no sway beyond the fortresses or fortified camps which they occupy—Those parts of the country which had submitted, on the retiring of the troops of Ibrahim and Reschid Pachas have again risen in open and active rebellion. The large American frigate had arrived, and the command was given to Miaulis—Lord Cochrane was also speedily expected—Great suffering however was experienced for the want of provisions and clothing. We hope it will shortly be relieved by the liberal supplies which are going from our own and other countries. The worst circumstance in the affairs of Greece is civil disunion, and the disposition of the commanders and crews of their vessels of war to engage in piratical enterprises—From these circumstances, we fear that they will not be able to settle their affairs without foreign interference, even if they should be successful in freeing their country from Turkish invasion. The Turks are said by the last accounts to be sending a considerable force to the Morea, direct from Constantinople.

ASIA.

It would seem as if the Dutch were likely to be entirely expelled from the island of Java. It has for some time been known that a formidable insurrection of the natives against the Dutch government had taken place; and it appears by recent accounts that about the first of October last, the insurgents defeated the Dutch troops; and it is said *annihilated* them in a general engagement. A letter writer says—"We know not what troops are coming from Europe; but if five or six thousand men do not arrive in a few weeks, twenty thousand will not save Java, for every mile the insurgents advance their strength increases."

AFRICA.

It appears that a British ship of war has arrived in England from the coast of Africa, "bringing intelligence that Captain Clapperton had arrived at the residence of Sultan Soolim, at Sackatoo, and been well received. Dr. Dixon had arrived at Youra, five days' journey from the Soolima country. Captain Clapperton would immediately proceed to Tombuctoo, to be there joined by Mr. Dixon, and they would then make their best way to the ulterior objects of their journey." The gallant Col. Purden, who commanded the British and African forces against the Ashantees, had also arrived in London, bringing information that the king of the Ashantees had died of the wounds he received, in the battle in which his army was defeated.

AMERICA.

HAYTI.—The last information received from this island is, that Hayti refuses to fulfil her engagements to France, relative to half duties; that France seems determined to compel compliance; and that war is likely to be the consequence.

BUENOS AYRES and BRAZIL.—By an arrival in forty-eight days from Montevideo we learn "that Admiral Brown was blockading the Brazilian fleet in the Uruguay river; and that a heavy force of Brazilian vessels was cruising between Montevideo and Buenos Ayres. Several engagements had been fought, but none of any consequence."

COLOMBIA.—The general congress of this republick has been convened, and the Liberator, Bolivar, has addressed to the president of the senate, under date of Feb. 6th, a letter, of which the following is the conclusion:—

"Republicans, jealous of their liberties, cannot consider me without a secret dread; because the pages of history tell them that all those placed in similar situations, have been ambitious. In vain do I wish to propose the example of Washington as my defence; and in fact, one or many exceptions can effect nothing against the experience of the world, which has always been oppressed by the powerful.

"I sigh between the distress of my fellow citizens, and the sentence which awaits me in the judgment of posterity. I, myself, am aware that I am not free from ambition, and therefore I desire to extricate myself from the grasp of that fury, to free my fellow citizens from all inquietude, and to secure after my death, that reputation which I may be intitled to, for my zeal in the cause of liberty.

"With such sentiments, I renounce again and again, the presidency of the republick. Congress and the nation must receive this abdication as irrevocable; nothing will be able to oblige me to continue in the publick service, to which I have already dedicated my entire life: and now that the triumph of liberty has placed this sublime right within the enjoyment of every one, shall I alone be deprived of it? No: the Congress and the Colombian people are just; they will not compel me to an ignominious *desertion*. Few are the days which now remain to me: more than two-thirds of my existence has already passed; let me, therefore, be permitted to await a peaceful death in the obscure and silent retreat of my paternal residence—my sword and my heart will nevertheless be always with Colombia, and my last sighs will ascend to Heaven, in prayers for her continual prosperity.

"I pray, therefore, Congress and my fellow citizens, to confer on me the title of a *Private Citizen*.

"God guard your Excellency,

Signed. "SIMON BOLIVAR."

UNITED STATES.—We have no domestick information of importance to record. The difference between the government of the United States and the State of Georgia seems likely to pass over, without other serious consequences than the unhappy precedent which has been furnished, of a single state opposing, explicitly and decisively, a treaty formed by the general government.

*** Within the last month the following note has been addressed to the Editor of the Christian Advocate—and is given to the publick as he received it.

New York, March 14, 1827.

Dear Sir,—We have availed ourselves of the union of another paper with ours, to add to our title; which will hereafter be "Christian Advocate and Journal." This we hope will be satisfactory to you: and as the subject was noticed in your January No., perhaps it may be agreeable to you to name this addition in some future No.

Very respectfully, yours,

N. BANGS & I. EMORY.